ON THE STRUCTURING OF SANSKRIT DRAMA

Structure of Drama in Bharata and Aristotle

B. K. THAKKAR
Department of English
Sardar Patel University
Vallabh Vidyanagar

WITH A FOREWORD
by
PROFESSOR ESTHER A SOLOMON
Head, Department of Sanskrit
Gujarat University, Ahmedabad.

Saraswati Pustak Bhandar, Ahmedabad.

1984

© Mrs. Hasumati Thakkar, Bazaar, Vadnagar
(North Gujarat).

Rs. 60-00/ $ 10/-

Publishers : Ashwin B. Shah
Saraswati Pustak Bhandar, Ahmedabad.

Printers : Saraswati Compos, Khanpur, Ahmedabad.

सद्गुरुकृपाफलमिदम् ।
गुरुचरणाभ्याम् समर्पितम् ॥

PREFACE

This essay is an attempt to explore the structuring of Sanskrit drama through an analysis of the concepts of the nature of drama, the function of drama, and the "plotting" of drama in Bharata and Aristotle.

I am grateful to Professor (Miss) Esther A. Solomon of Gujarat University, Ahmedabad for kindly accepting to write the foreword.

I must put here on record my thanks to Dr. V.M. Bhatt of the Department of Sanskrit, Gujarat University, but for whose constant encouragement and invaluable help with the Sanskrit texts, this "just could not have happened".

I am also thankful to Shri Ashvinbhai B. Shah of Saraswati Pustak Bhandar for accepting to publish the book and bringing it out in a matter of months.

Vallabh Vidyanagar,
June 22, 1984. B. K. Thakkar

FOREWORD

It is heartening to find Shri B. K. Thakkar, a well-read teacher of English in the Sardar Patel University, bringing a fresh approach to the study of Sanskrit drama in his book *On the Structuring of Sanskrit Drama*. He has throughout tried to sympathetically capture the concept of Sanskrit Drama as understood by Bharata and as evinced in the structure of Sanskrit Drama that he prescribes in his Nāṭya Śāstra.

Prof. Thakkar's main emphasis is on the 'aesthetic distancing' in Sanskrit Drama. Drama was meant to be a 'Krīḍanīyaka', 'an audio-visual diversion for the people who found themselves to be too much engrossed in their worldly worries'. It was not meant to be an 'anubhāvana,' 'an enactment through gestures', of a slice of life', but it

was conceived as 'bhāvānukirtan', a presenting of the forms of the 'bhāvās', the life emotions, transformed into aesthetic sentiments, the 'rasas'. Bharata achieves this by emphasizing stylization in matters of acting in its different aspects — gestures, costumes, make-up and so on and by insisting that a play should end on the note of the marvellous sentiment ('adhbhuta rasa'). In his inquiry into the process of distancing, Prof. Thakkar, it seems, tends to overstress the role that destiny is supposed to play in Sanskit Drama. It may be true to say that one does not have in Sanskrit Drama the intellectual satisfaction of seeing the characters grow before our very eyes. Nevertheless the characters are not just puppets of destiny who are absolved of all responsibility for their actions. Duṣyanta and Rāma as they are conceived could act and behave only as they do; and destiny does not figure in all Sanskrit plays. Nevertheless, Prof. Thakkar has rightly stressed the distancing of art-experience from actual life experience.

Prof. Thakkar has brought his up-to-date knowledge of Western Criticism to bear on the different aspects of Sanskrit Drama. He has explored the theoretical aspects of the concepts of 'anukirtana', 'bhāva' and 'sandhis' governing the structuring of Sanskrit Drama in the context of similar concepts governing Western Drama. The aim is to sharply focus on the peculiarities of Sanskrit Drama by pointing out the differences. The usual practice is to emphasize the similarities of the Sanskrit Drama and the Western Drama. Wells chose to stress the peculiarities of Sanskrit Drama, but he concentrates on drama and keeps

the theory in the background. Prof. hakkar, on the other hand, deals with the theory which served as the frame within which the Sanskrit dramatist was expected to work. He does not see any reason why scholars should lament the lack of tragedy in Sanskrit. As Henry W. Wells says, "[The Sanskrit Drama] is a celebration of cosmic poise, a highly formal and unmistakably aesthetic projection of life idealistically conceived" (*The Classical Drama of India*, p. 142). Prof. Thakkar would say, "Formally then, the Sanskrit Drama is at a height to which Shakespeare has to climb up through the comedies, the trageoies, the histories and the Roman plays. The conscious artificiality, the distinguishing between art and reality, and the sense of completeness are common to the last plays of Shakespeare and the Sanskrit Drama : the final step in the same direction, the sophistication through stylization is the privilege of Sanskrit Drama only". Prof. Thakkar believes that a true appreciation of the differences of the theory and practice of drama in Sanskrit and in the West should enhance the understanding of Sankrit Drama by the Western audience.

I am very glad that Prof. Thakkar has presented to the serious readers a learned and critically appreciative study of the differnt aspects of the structuring of Sanskrit drama and brought out its peculiarities. I wish him further achievements in his learned pursuits.

Ahmedabad
1-6-84

—E. A. Solomon

I

The traditional approach to Sanskrit drama is through the *Nāṭyaśāstra*[1] of the sage Bharata, a work of great antiquity, believed to have been composed around two thousand years ago. It is a sprawling manual of dramaturgy. The focus is always on the production of

a play. The text furnished by the poet is regarded as only one of the items needed for such a production.

Bharata gives an account of the divine origin of drama and calls it the 'fifth' veda in addition to the four that were already revealed. This fifth, the *nāṭya veda* was supposed to incorporate in it something from each of the four *vedas*.[2]

The *NŚ* presupposes neither a practice nor a theory of drama. Apart from the nearly sixty percent of the text devoted to the aspects of production such as music, dancing, acting etc. at the centre is primarily the function of drama, the generating of the emotions peculiar to art experience, the *rasa* theory. It is in the context of this *rasa* theory that everything else including the nature of drama is defined. It is this *rasa* theory that forms the basis of the structuring of Sanskrit drama.

In this context, by 'structuring' I mean 'the inner working principle'.

Shipleys *Dictionary of World Literary Terms*[3] defines structure as "the sum total of elements that make up the form of a work".

Three of the meanings of 'structure' given by *Oxford English Dictionary*[4] are :

Structure (sb) :

a. The action, practice, or process of building or construction :

b. The natural relation of constituent parts or elements of a whole as determining its peculiar nature or character.

Structure (v.) (rare) :

a. To build or form into a structure; to organise the parts or elements of (something) in structural form.

The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics[5] defines 'structure' as "the sum of the relationships of the parts of a literary whole to one another . . ."

In the light of these definitions, 'the inner working principle' may be construed as the complex of the organising principles governing the relating of the parts and of building up of the whole.

In the *NŚ* the terms for these organising principles are the *anukīrtanam,* the *bhāva* and the *sandhis* denoting the trio of the concepts of the nature, the function and the plotting of drama.

I have sought here to explore the theoretical aspects of these concepts governing the 'structuring' of Sanskrit drama in the context of similar concepts governing the Western drama and first enunciated by Aristotle. The aim is not to compare and contrast the two sets of principles, but to rather more sharply focus on the peculiarities of Sanskrit drama by pointing out the differences.

This line of argument would seem to run counter to the more practised line of seizing upon the similarities. It is in Henry W. Wells[6] that we find these peculiarities adequately noticed and discussed. But Wells keeps the theory firmly in the background and concentrates on drama. The present essay is almost exclusively about

the theory that is supposed to have been the frame within which a dramatist was expected to work.

I offer here a discussion of 'mimesis', 'catharis', 'plot', '*bhāvānukīrtanam*' and the '*sandhis*' with a view to comprehending the structure and the over–all impact of Sanskrit drama.

It would be difficult to give an account of the extensive debates in the East and the West that these concepts have generated. Since I aim at viewing the pattern, a paring down of the conflicting opinions to the fundamentals and achieving thereby a perspective is found more helpful.

On the basis of the inquiry and the analysis undertaken, a few conclusions are ventured expecting a further discussion. After all, the highest satisfaction in such matters can only be one of stirring up a hornets' nest.

II

Manmohan Ghosh, in the Introduction to his translation of the *NŚ* quotes from T Twining's eighteenth century–1789–translation of Aristotle's *Poetics* :

> Terror and pity may be raised by the decoration – the mere spectacle; but they

> may also arise from the circumstances of the action itself; which is far preferable and shows a superior poet. For the fable should be so constructed that, without the assistance of the sight, its incidents may excite horror and commiseration in those who hear them only . . .
>
> But to produce this effect by means of the decoration discovers want of art in the poet; who must also be supplied by the public with an expensive apparatus"[1].
>
> o o o
>
> The decoration has also a great effect, but of all the parts is most foreign to the art. For the power of tragedy is felt without representation and actors . . . [2]

A modern translation of *Poetics*, Leo Golden's, published in 1968 glosses these passages thus :

> Pity and fear can arise from the spectacle and also from the very structure of the plot, which is the superior way and shows the better poet. The poet should construct the plot so that even if the action is not performed before spectators, one who merely hears the incidents that have occured both shudders and feels pity from the way they turn out. That is what anyone who

> hears the plot of the *Oedipus* would experience. The achievement of this effect through the spectacle does not have much to do with poetic art . . . [3]
>
> o o o
>
> For the power of tragedy is felt even without a dramatic performance and actors . . . [4]

Manmohan Ghosh[5] quotes Aristotle to show that the Greek commentator stressed action and tended to disregard the spectacle. The *NŚ* on the other hand is hardly a treatise on drama. It is rather a sprawling and yet minutely detailed manual on the performance of drama written with the full consciousness of drama as a multi–media art form relying for its effect, the *Rasānubhava*, not merely on the text prepared or composed by the poet but on many other factors such as acting, costumes, dancing, music, choreography, direction, the playhouse and the like. A little more than a fourth of the entire *NŚ* is devoted to music. Of the rest, large sections are devoted to the construction of the playhouses, the preliminaries of performances, the acting using the eyes, the facial expressions, the hands, the feet, the body, the costumes, the make–up, the speech rhythms, the dancing and so on. The sections that might strictly concern the poet are those that spell out the linking of incidents – the *Sandhis* –, the *Rasa* theory as the function of drama and the prosody.

For Bharata, drama is essentially drama in perfor-

mance. There is even a law about the proper time for the performance of a play depending upon the subject matter[6], the use of music, the chief sentiment of the work and so on. Bharata does not forget to add that despite the indications regarding the time, an emergency performance such as when a patron ordered, could always take place regardless of the time factor. As Manmohan Ghosh summarises,[6]

> Though at the command of the patron the Director of a theartical party could overlook strict rules in this regard, the time of performance was to be regulated according to the nature of the subject matter of the individual play. For example, a playbased on a tale of virtue was to be performed in the forenoon; a performance which was rich in instrumental music, and told a story of strengsh and energy, was to be held in the afternoon, and a play which related to the Graceful Style, the Erotic Sentiment, and required vocal and instrumental music for its production, was to be performed in the evening; but in case of plays which related to the magnanimity of the Hero and contained mostly the Pathetic Sentiment, Performance was to be held in the morning.[7]

Compared with the sophistication of a dramatic

performance one finds in the *NŚ* the performance of Greek drama, rather the performance of a series of plays in an open-air theatre all through the major part of a spring day featuring the dancing of the chorus and the shouting of the speeehes through the tragic and the comic masques, sounds rather crude.

That more than one play was performed on the same day can be gathered from this passages in Aristophanes' *Birds* :

> There's nothing better, more delightful than having wings.
> Imagine, you in the audience, if *you* had them
> You hit on a boring tragedy, you're hungry,
> No need to sit it out, you're home, in a flap,
> Have a good meal, then back— for our comedy.[8]

H. C. Baldry describes one such day of the dramatic performances :

> The place : the theatre of Dionysus . . . The time : the dawn of a fine spring day late in March, 458 B. C. . . . This morning the citizens are gathered together again in the theatre to see another spectacle — *drama*, 'performance', is their word for it. They sit on wooden benches on the curving hillside, a natural amphitheatre, facing the sun, and

> here they willstay till late afternoon. They have breakfasted well, for there will be no interval for refreshments. Although they have each paid two obols—a third of a day's wage to come in, more than fifteen thousand are here . . .

> This hillside is the *theatron*—the 'watching place. 'From it the vast crowd looks down on to a circle of level ground rimmed with stone, separated by only a few feet from the front row of seats. The circle, more than twenty yards across, is the dancing ground—the *orchestra*.[9]

It is quite likely the Greek audiences took in the whole of the dramatic performance : the text, the music the dancing. But this too is a fact that to make the speeches audible to a large congregation in an open air theatre, they had to be shouted through the masks. In any case Aristotle concerned himself exclusively with the text of the drama and came up with a comprehensive treatise.

The process of disregarding the performance aspect in India is not of recent origin. It is found, for instance in Dhanañjaya :

> . . . Dhanañjaya in restating the principles of dramaturgy . . . carried too far the work

> of his abridgement and left out quite a number of important matters. The special stress which he lays on the literary aspect of drama by his exclusion of its histrionics and other technical sides, very clearly indicates the general decadence of India's aesthetic culture at the time.[10]

In modern times, once again, drama is being recognised as essentially a multi-media art form. As a theorist, Susan K. Langer, puts it,

> Once we recognise that drama is neither dance nor literature, nor a democracy of various arts functioning together, but is poetry in the mode of action, the relatious of all its elements to each other and to the whole work become clear : the primacy of the script, which furnishes the commanding form; the use of the stage, with or without representational scenery, to delimit the "world" in which the virtual action exists; the need of making the "scene" a place . . . the use of music and sometimes of dance . . . [11]

And this is Alan Ayckborn, Britain's most successful dramatist :

> At least with a stage play, with any luck, there will be a second, and even a third, fourth and fifth chance. There is always the slim possibility that, one night somewhere, the chemistry will be right. The right cast will meet the right audience in the right theatre and something rich and rewarding will be shared between them.[12]

Bharata would certainly have been delighted to see the energy now being expended on mastering the use of the face, the eyes, the eyebrows, the hands, the fingers the feet, the body and so on in the various schools of drama run by the professionals and the universities as also in the various workshops and summer schools organised every year. Even a writer of the stature of T.S. Eliot listened to E. Martin Browne,[13] the director of his plays. And yet, it is not quite the same thing. For Susan K. Langer, the most important factor in a dramatic performance is the script. In the passage quoted above she is specific; it is "the primacy of the script which furnishes the commanding form", whereas, in case of Sanskrit drama, as Henry W. Wells puts it,

> . . . the signature of the individual workman, so important in the eyes of the connoisseurs in other quarters of the civilized world, remains comparatively faint.[14]

III

Plato's famous theory of art as something that is 'twice removed from reality' is to be found in his "*Republic Book X*" As Richard Lewis Nettleship explains,

According to Plato there are three grades of making and three corresponding makers

> to be distinguished. There is first, the making of that which is in the order of nature . . . of which the only maker is God . . . Secondly, there are the ordinary artificial things used in life, which are made by the craftsman or artisan. Thirdly, there is a product which consists in the appearance of such things (particular concrete objects) as the artisan makes and the maker of this product is the artist . . . The artist according to Plato merely holds up the mirror to nature, and does nothing more.[1]

The passage in "*Republic Book X*" which is the subject of Nettleship's summary reads thus :

> Let us take for our present purpose, any instance of such a group; there are beds and tables in the world . . . But there are only two ideas of forms of such furniture–one the idea of a bed, the other of a table . . . And the painter too is, as I conceive just such another–a creator of appearances . . . God . . . made one bed in nature and one only . . . And what shall we say of the carpenter–is not he also the maker of a bed ? Yes. But would you call the painter an artificer and maker ? Certainly not . . . then you call him whose product is third in the

> descent from the nature, an imitator ? . . . And so if the tragic poet is an imitator, he too is thrice removed from the king and from the truth . . . [2]
>
> o o o
>
> And there is another artificer . . . One who is the maker of all other workmen . . . there are many ways in which the feat might be quickly and easily accomplished, none quicker than that of turning a mirror round and round . . . [3]

Plato's theory of art as imitation of the concrete which is in turn a copy of the idea is based on his theory of ideas. For him, as his example of the mirror images of the concrete objects implies, art is as unreal as a mirror image.

Aristotle in his *Poetics* was supposed to be answering this charge of art being 'twice removed from reality. Yet, he too considers art to be 'imitation'.

> Now epic poetry, tragedy, comedy, dithyrambic poetry, and most forms of flute and lyre playing all happen to be, in general imitations . . .[4]

To keep Aristotle within the confines of Plato's theory of ideas and yet to escape the charge of mechani-

cal imitation, it was only necessary to show that Aristotle was merely shifting the position of the artist from the bottom of the chain at the head of which was God the maker of ideas, and in the middle, the maker of concrete objects, to the middle, between God and the artisan. This is what the neo-Platonists did. As Hardison, Jr. paraphrases one of them, Proclus,

> . . . the poet, being divinely inspired, sees farther and higher than most men. If he produces a bed, it is a bed charged with divine *energia* and hence truer than the one produced by the carpenter. In other words, instead of being a fabricator of falsehoods and a purveyor of corruption, the poet has the priestlike function of revealing truth to men's clouded vision.[5]

The problem of understanding 'imitation' is really the problem of relating life and art, art and reality. Susan K. Langer uses the term "semblance" derived from "Schein" to describe such a relationship :

> All forms in art, then are abstracted forms; their content is only a semblance, a pure appearance whose function is to make them, too, apparent—more freely and wholly apparent than they could be if they were exemplified in a context of real circumstance

and anxious interest. It is in this elementary sense that all art is abstract.[6]

Harvey D. Goldstein quotes from Aristotle's *Physics* and *Metaphysics* to propound that imitation, according to Aristotle implied a process of ordering in art. He concludes,

> . . . the doctrine does not declare that art is nature—rather it establishes art as art, for it says that art and art alone in its production or creation imitates the way that nature produces or creates. This puts the emphasis on the organisation of the work of art, the principles by which the work has been ordered, the work's peculiar synthesis. Thus the art-work, in its organization, its wholeness, is seen to be purely the product of art . . . the mimesis doctrine indicates that the significant fact, the differentia indeed, of art as a genus is precisely this organisation . . .[7]

When one comes to the interpretation given by O. B. Hardison, Jr., one feels the logical conclusion of the principle or organisation in art is reached. Goldstein finds the principle implicit in nature. Hardison, Jr. finds the artist, like the philosopher, seeking to subsume 'the

world of undifferentiated "singulars" under a system of universal propositions, :

> Two corollaries follow . . . First, Aristotle's placement of poetry has some kinship with the aesthetic theory of poetry popularized in the nineteenth century by Coleridge and Croce, among others . . . it draws a sharp line between art on the one hand, and utilitarian and moral activities on the other . . . The second corollary is that whether by accident or design, Aristotle's theory is an emphatic answer to Plato's attack on poetry . . .
>
> If all human activities are placed on a simple linear scale ranging from absolute truth to falsehood, Socrates is right. If, however, there are different categories of human activity, each with its separate and distinct methodology, he is wrong . . . Socrates would have us judge a painting of a bed with the same criteria that we use to judge a bed made by a carpenter. Aristotle, conversely, would have us judge the carpenter's bed by one set of rules, a functional set, and the picture of the bed by an entirely different set, based on the painter's skill in combining forms and colours . . . [8]

o o o

To appreciate Aristotle's understanding of art, we must remember that he found two extremes in the world. The first is what might be called "the world of undifferentiated singulars". This world is chaotic. It is unitelligible because the singulars seem to have no relation to one another. At the opposite extreme is the world of universals . . . Philosophy subsumes the world of undifferentiated "singulars" under a system of universal propositions. They make the world intelligible, and to the extent that they are true, they bring out the innate order of nature . . .[9]

o o o

[the poet's] special task is to discover actions—simple, unified processes—in a world of undifferentiated singulars. . . . A poetic plot derived from history is therefore an interpretation, an understanding, of history.[10]

IV

A recent improptu survey on the interpretations of 'catharsis' over the years seeks to show that the critics tend to read into this term just whatever might occur to them or might be convenient to them in the light of their own theories about literature. Indeed, critics and

writers ranging from James Joyce, Richard B. Sewall and Scott Buchanan to Hubert Heffner, Northrop Frye and Eric Bently have taken 'catharsis' to mean quite different things. The survey ends almost on a note of exasperation :

> I am not suggesting that the question of the real meaning of catharsis should be completely dropped, though it should certainly be minimized; nor do I feel that some of the more distortive uses of the term have not been productive . . . but I do maintain that other vital issues are at hand waiting to be explored. We need to venture into the uncharted region of affective criticism and not simply rest content with catharsis in any of its present guises as a sufficient account of what happens in the experience of tragedy.[1]

The term 'catharsis' in *Poetics* is a part of Aristotle's definition of tragedy :

> Tragedy . . . achieves through the representation of pitiable and fearful incidents, the catharsis of such pitiable and fearful incidents.[2]

This term is first used in *Politics* :

> One of the functions of music is to effect a catharsis.[3]

In *Politics* Aristotle promises to explain this term later but does not keep his promise. In the absence of any clear indication from Aristotle, the term is interpreted as either 'purgation' or 'purification' on the lines of a medical metaphor. For Milton, for instance, 'catharsis' is a purging of the excess of emotions :

> . . . to temper and reduce them to just measure with a kind of delight, stirred up by reading or seeing those passions well imitated.[4]

Butcher, on the other hand thinks the term implies 'purification,' a purging of "impure element" :

> Pity and fear awakened in connexion with these larger aspects or human suffering, and kept in close alliance with one another, become universalised emotions. What is purely personal and self-regarding drops away. The spectator who is brought face to face with grander sufferings than his own exceriences a sympathetic ecstasy, or lifting out of himself. It is precisely in this transport of feeling, which carries a man beyond his personal self, that the distinctive tragic pleasure resides. Pity and fear are purged of impure element which clings to them in life. In the glow of tragic excitement these feelings are so transformed that the net result is a noble emotional satisfaction.[5]

Though catharsis specifically refers to 'tragedy', and a particular set of emotions, the term has been, over the centuries, more generally interpreted, and has come now to be almost synonymous with the function of art, with the emotive aspect of literature and art.

Since Plato had objected to art on the grounds of knowledge and being—art being twice removed from reality, cannot give knowledge; its appeal to the emotions, particularly the baser emotions, brings about an emotional imbalance in the reader and the spectator—it was thought a theory of 'mimesis' and 'catharsis' propounded by Aristotle properly interpreted would be an effective answer. This led to the practice of considering 'mimesis' as nature of art and 'catharsis' as its function. The one was to establish a correspondence and a relationship between life and art whereas the other was to take into account the effect of art on the reader or the spectator. It is no wonder therefore that the theories on 'catharsis' should be audience response theories :

> . . . Bywater, in his listing of eighty-five commentators on the catharsis clause, does not list one who did not interpret this clause in relation to the audience. Nor could I, in reviewing the writers since Bywater's time, find more than two who held that catharsis of pity and fear had an aesthetic rather than a psychological meaning.[6]

These two writers, listed by Goldstein are Heinrich

Otte and G. F. Else. To this short list must be added Hubert Heffner and O. B. Hardison, Jr. Let us take three of these in the chronological order. Here is Gerald F. Else :

> The present book suggests fundamental reinterpretations of a number of major terms and concepts in the *Poetics*. [One of these is 'catharsis.'][7]

o o o o

> . . . what will be the judgment and the feelings of a normal spectator or hearer or reader when confronted with a tragic story ? [8]

o o o o

> . . . the catharis is not a change or end–product in the spectator's soul . . . but a process carried forward in the emotional material of the play by its structural elements. . .[9]

o o o o

This is Hubert Heffner :

> To interpret . . . catharsis as purely psychological phenomena of audience response

> is not merely a misinterpretation of their nature but also contributes to the destruction of the idea of form in drama. The catharsis or purgation must likewise occur in the play before it can affect audience.[10]

In Hardison, Jr. is found the carefully worked out thesis on interpreting 'catharsis' outside the traditional audience response framework. What Else and Heffner seem to suggest, Hardison, Jr. reaches to its logical conclusion:

> At the beginning of Chapter IV "pleasure" emerges as the fourth basic element of imitative art . . . Since Aristotle's formal definition of tragedy in Chapter VI incorporates the first three basic elements (means, object, manner), we would expcct him to incorporate the fourth one also. He evidently does this in the catharsis clause. Catharsis should therefore be understood as the tragic variety of the pleasure associated with imitation in general, and equated with the function *(ergon)* of tragedy mentioned at the beginning of Chapter XIII . . . Most translations of the catharsis clause in Chapter VI relate catharsis not to the incidents of the play but to the emotions of pity and fear . . . Such translations relate catharsis to the psychology of the spectator

rather than to what happenns in the tragedy itself. But the *Poetics* is a *techne* — a technical treatise concerned with the nature of tragedy, not the response of the audience. The present translation [Leo Golden's] reflects this fact by relating catharsis to incidents rather than to emotions. It is supported by Aristotle's statement . . . from Chapter XIV, that the tragic pleasure "must be worked into the incidents".

. . . the Greek word *Katharsis* can mean "clarification" as well as "purgation" or "purification" . . . in Chapter IV Aristotle insists at some length that imitation does not produce "pleasure in general" but only the sort of pleasure that comes from learning [which] comes from discovering a relation between the object represented and certain universal elements embodied in it . . . When the spectator has witnessed a tragedy of this type, he will have learned something — the incidents will be clarified in the sense that their relation in terms of universals will have become manifest — and the act of learning, says Aristotle, will be enjoyable.

This interpretation . . . was first proposed by Leon Golden. It has many virtues . . .

> it makes the clause a reference to the *techne* of tragedy, not to the psychology of the audience. Second, it relates catharsis both to the theory of imitation . . . and to the discussion of probability. . . [11]

All interpreters of Aristotle's 'mimesis' have sought to read into the term the artist's creative relationship with nature. Hardison, Jr. sharpens this common factor of the traditional interpretations and compares the creative activity of the artist with the philosophical activity of the philosopher. Both in their own way seek to discover order in the chaos of the 'undifferentiated singulars'. This interpretation he effectively joins with his interpretation of 'catharsis' as 'clarification', making the nature and function of art two phases of a continuous process, the first one of discovering order, and the second one of weaving it into ihe action, into a unified whole with a view to 'clarifying' it. It is this activity of 'mimesis' and 'catharsis' that is pleasurable, and, by extension, when perceived as such, should be pleasurable for the spectator/reader too.

V

The *NŚ* begins with the origins and the history of the evolution of drama. Here are found the clues to Bharata's concept of the nature of drama.

Drama, we are told, was created by Brahman as an audio-visual diversion, a *krīḍanīyakam*, in response to

a request made by the gods to help people who had "become addicted to sensual pleasures, were under the sway of desire and greed, (had become) infatuated with jealousy and anger, (and) found their happiness mixed with sorrow."[1]

Later, dramatic performance is defined as *bhāvānukīrtanam*[2], the significant term of this compound being *bhāva*, an emotion, implying the function of dramatic performance and laying the cornerstone of the *rasa* theory. Read in the context of the term *krīḍanīyakam*, the *rasa* theory, primarily stresses the role of emotions in life : the people were too much engrossed in the affairs of their lives and needed a diversion, presumably to retain their sanity, but the diversion that a dramatic performance would provide need not be altogether different in kind from life experience, the *rasa* to be generated by a dramatic performance must run parallel to one of the *bhāvas*, that is one of the eight basic emotional states. It is this parallelism that would ensure recognition, communication and enjoyment of the art experience. While the life emotion may sway the personality and may evoke a pleasurable or unpleasurable response, depending upon the nature and context of such experiences, the art experience generating the *rasa* must be uniformly pleasurable. Though there is some coutroversy regarding the uniform pleasurableness of the *rasa* as also regarding the final number of the basic emotional states, the *bhāvas*, and the parallel *rasas* there being a tendency to add one more, the *śānta rasa*[3], the sentiment of quiescence to the number, there is a general

agreement about the qualitative difference between life experience and art experience.

The *rasa* theory is built upon the assumption that just as certain situations, utterances, or objects evoke an emotional response in life, similar stimuli can be incorporated into a work of art to evoke emotional response to a work of art and a pattern of such responses can be presented to give the spectator an experience which may satisfy him, may divert him, may provide him with a *krīḍanīyakam*.

Such stimuli in life, as well as when incorporated into a work of art, are designated as *vibhāvas*. Both in life and art, the immediate response evoked by such *vibhāvas* taking the form of a gesture, a sound, a voluntary or involuntary movement of the body and the like is designated as the *anubhāva*.

Bharata declines to define *vibhāvas* and *anubhāvas* precisely as they are also matters of life experience.[4]

In addition to the *anubhāvas*, the *vibhāvas* may also evoke one or the other of the thirty-three transitory emotional states known as the *vyabhicārī bhāvas*, which might eventually activate one or the other of the eight or nine basic emotional states or the *sthāyi bhāvas*. The eight or nine *rasas* form a parallel to these *sthāyi bhāvas*.[5] On the basis of this categorisation of the *vyabhicārī bhāvas*, the *sthāyi bhāvas*, and the *rasas*, Bharata lays down that all *vibhāvas* could be divided into forty-nine categories.[6]

The nature of drama, or a dramatic performance, according to Bharata, is the *anukīrtanam* of these *bhāvas*,

This definition of drama is offered in the context of an account given of the origion of drama. The first performance of drama was attacked by the demons who found in it a contrast between themselves and gods. They attack the performance because they feel humiliated and insulted by the contrast enacted on the stage.

At first the demons are simply vanquished, but later on there is a move to pacify them. They are told the drama is not *anubhāvanam*, a mere imitation through gestures of life experience, but *anukīrtanam*.

Bharata does not define what he means by *anukirtanam*. Many of the commentators who followed him, it is believed, regarded *anukīrtanam* as *anukaraṇam*, that is imitation. Abhinavagupta quotes from those who interpreted *anukīrtanam* as imitation and refutes this interpretation on the grounds of logic, philosophy and psychology. He establishes the autonomy of art experience, establishes it as an experience *sui generis* by demonstrating that it cannot be explained by taking recourse to any of the ten categories of the manipulation and apprehension of reality.

Abhinavagupta seeks to explain *anukīratanam* by defending it as *anuvyavasāya*. It is likely that this was a

common enough term in his days, but its meaning is now lost to us.

The term is also to be found in *Nyāyasūtra Vātsyāyana Bhāṣya* 1.1 4.[7] *Anuvyavasāya* here means the mental perception of any phenomenon experienced through the senses. This would be *anukīrtanam*, the nature of drama. And the object of this *anukīrtanam* must be *bhāva*, that is emotion. The nature and function of a dramatic performance is thus defined by the compound *bhāvānukīrtanam* as distinguished from *anubhāvanam*.

What is found in a dramatic performance is thus the generating of the *rasa* which is a reflection of some *sthāyi bhāva*, basic emotional state and hence communicable and perceivable. Its enjoyment must qualitatively differ from life experience, for it is not to be 'experienced' but to be perceived by the mind. As K. C. Pandey, G. B. Mohan Thampi and Pravas Jivan Chaudhury seek to explain it,

> Aesthetic experience is different from ordinary every day experience which is due to diadic relation of subject and object, because it is got, not through the objective perception of the presented, but through subjective realization of that which is not objectively presented but to which the artistic medium points : It is due to a triadic relation,[8]

o o o

Indian Aesthetic thinking is primarily audience – or reader – oriented and the center of much discussion is the response of the readers.[9]

o o o

. . . in poetic experience the emotional states are not simply undergone or suffered; they are perceived and tasted. The Sanskrit words which describe this process are *carvaṇa* which means masticating and *rasana* which means tasting. These words refer to the reader's imaginative reconstruction of the meanings and the identity of the poem and to his active enjoyment of the emotions even while they reverberate in his heart.[10]

o o o

. . . as interpreted by Abhinavagupta, *rasa* is at once an emotional on exaltation and a state of serenity.[11]

o o o

The secret [of aesthetic delight] is the intellectual operation involved in aesthetic experience where the emotions are evoked in the mind through suggestion.[12]

It is believed, traditionally *anuvyavasāya* meant knowledge of knowledge.[13] Similarly, Vasudev Sharan Agrawal cites Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*[14] to show that *kīrtanam* could as well mean a memorial. In the light of these interpretations, *bhāvānukīrtanam* can be taken to mean the knowledge of the knowledge of an emotion, that is the intellection aspect of an emotion as distinguished from the feeling aspect of emotion. A dramatic performance, then, should organise the *vibhāvas* and the *anubhāvas* in such a way rhat they may generate the *vyabhicāri bhāvas* and activate the *sthāyi bhāvas* which would be experienced as *rasas* and not as emotions, experienced as perceived by the mind. *Kīrtanam* interpr eted as a memorial then, would imply that just as 'form' is the meaning aspect of a memorial, the dramatic performance is also experienced as a form, a configuration of the *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas*, *vyabhicāri bhāvas* and *sthāyi bhāvas* resulting in the generating and intellection of the *rasa*.

Bharata has categorically stated that in the absence of the *rasa*, no meaning is communicated.[15] In other words, the meaning of a work of art as is commonly understood, is not to be the purpose of a work of art.

Yet, the configuration of the *vibhāvas*, the *anubhāvas*, the *vyabhicāri bhāvas*, the *sthāyī bhāvas* and the *rasas* will be through a choreography of dance, acting, gestures, music, dialogue and poetry. Of these, poetry and dialogue must use language. Of the gestures, too, despite an adherence to stylisation, the mistaking of art experience for life experience cannot be totally ruled out. It is for this

reason that Bharata distinguishes between *anubhāvanam* and *bhāvānukīrtanam*. If art experience is to be confused with life experience, it would bring in the problem of value judgement, showing up gods and demons as good and bad. Since the demons mistook art for life, they attacked the performance. It may be inferred therefore, that Bharata's definition of drama is logically a precise one as it incorporates nature of drama, *anukīrtanam*, function of drama, *bhāva* and the differentia, *anukīrtanam* and not *anubhāvanm*. He establishes the autonomy of art experience—later discussed at length by Abhinavgupta — and shows an awareness of the problems of value judgment that might follow a failure to distinguish between art and life though the two may share the use of language and gestures.

Abhinavgupta describes the process of distancing art and life as *Sādhārańīranam*,[16] variously interpreted as idealisation (T. R. Chintamani), generalisation (S. K. Dey), a presentative potency (Ganesh Jha), universalisation (V. Bhattacharya), power of revelation or power of effectuation (R. Gnoli), or, context–limited contemplation, imaginative and sympathetic communication, imaginative activity of aesthetic contemplation (Raghavan).[17] Such *sādhāraṇīkaraṇam* is to be realised at the level of language.

It is believed the bliss derived from the intellection of the *rasa* is akin to the state of bliss resulting from the conteplation of the Supreme Spirit.[18]

To experience this bliss of the perception of the *rasa*, it is necessary for the spectator to approach art as art,

to rise above his narrow world of miseries and memories. One important consideration on the part of the spectator is previous experience, both of life and art. There is a suggestion in Kālidasa[19] that such an experience might stretch beyond the present existence into previous existencies. The comprehension of a particular *rasa* as *rasa* and not as *bhāva*, a life emotion, is a matter of breeding and higher consciousness, a privilege of the well-bred, "those who have long studied and contemplated poetry". Consequently they are more likely to reach a higher plane of pleasure, attain a state of bliss which is akin to the bliss of the contemplation of the Supreme Spirit :

> Some of the Hindu critics . . . understand much better than their Western colleagues the various aspects of emotion in the theater, which our writers so freely and banefully confuse : the feelings experienced by the actor, those experienced by the spectators, those presented as undergone by characters in the play, and finally the feeling that shines through the play itself — the vital feeling of the piece. This last they call *rasa*; it is a state of emotional knowledge, which comes only to those who have studied and contemplated poetry. It is supposed to be of Supernatural origin, because it is not like mundane feeling and emotion, but is detached, more of the spirit than of the viscera, pure and uplifting.[20]

VI

At the focussing point of Aristotle's principles of 'mimesis' and 'catharsis' is his principle of plot. When all his statments directly or indirectly connected with the plot are put together, it emerges that the 'plot' for Aristotle implies a causality, a nexus, with its resultant notion of the unity of action :

Now I mean by the plot the arrangement of the the incidents . . .[1]

(Chapter VI)

The most important of these parts [the six parts of a tragedy] is the arrangement of the incidents . . .[2]

(Chapter VI)

The first principle, then, and to speak figuratively, the soul of tragedy, is the plot. . .[3]

. . . tragedy is the imitation of a complete and whole action . . . To be a whole is to have a beginning and a middle and an end. By a "beginning" I mean that which is itself not, by necessity, after anything else but after which something naturally is or develops. By an "end" I mean exactly the opposite : that which is naturally after something else, either necessarily or customarily, but after which there is nothing else. By a "middle" I mean that which is itself, after something else and which has something else after it. It is necessary therefore that well-constructed plots not begin by chance, anywhere, nor end anywhere, but that they conform to the distinctions that have been made above.[4]

(Chapter VIII)

A plot is a unity . . . [5]

(Chapter VIII)

It is clear . . . that it is necessary for the poet to be more the poet of his plots than of his meters . . . [6]

(Chapter IX)

In the *NŚ*[7], the concept of the "plotting" of incidents is to be found in a separate section. The terms used, the *sandhis* and the *sandhyaṅgas* mean the links and the sublinks. Bharata recognises five major links and sixty–four sub–links, besides distinguishing between a main plot, the *ādhikārika*, and a sub–plot, the *prāsaṅgika*.

A poet is supposed to plot a sort of obstacle race wherein a hero, traditionally to be above and beyond criticism would be positioned to win a woman or a battle by overcoming the obstacles, very often with the help of the supernatural agencies.

The five points of linking, further subdivided into sixty-four sub–links are supposed to provide a sort of a guide not only for the "plotting", but is at times, also helpful in identifying and exploiting the crucial junctures for the purpose of dialogues. The concept of the *sandhis* and the *sandhyaṅgas* is at once elaborate and narrow, for it details almost exactly all possible points of intersection of the character, the situation and the

dialogue, but the overall situation is limited only to the achiever and his goal. The *prāsagñika* or the subordinate action is supposed to be an appendage only.

At the end of his learned thesis on the concept of the *sandhis*, T. G. Mainkar seeks to draw some parallels between the Western concept of 'plot' and the concept of the 'sandhis'. He comes to the implied causality in the Western concept via a book, *So, you Are Writing a Play*, by one Clayton Hamilton (other details not given), that perhaps no one would have thought of consulting on such an important topic. He quotes,

> We should not lose sight of the technical distinction between the underlying story and the play itself. The imagined situation may multiply itself into many situations. This natural development will be found to follow the logic of events and the logic of character. The logic of events is based on the relation between cause and effect. This task requires a selection of details, an arrangement of these details in accordance with a pattern ... [8]

These lines are quoted with a rejoinder built into the quotation itself, that the distinction betwee the story and the play is also to be found in Bharata, under the terms, the *Itivṛtta* and the *Kāvya*. The two verses that are quoted from Bharata literally mean,

> Expressing the desired object, non-omission of any essential item in the Plot, accession to feeling in production, concealment of the objects to be concealed, telling tales of surprise and disclosing things to be disclosed are the six fold needs of the Limbs described in the Śāstra.[9]

One wonders what parallels are perceived here by the scholar. The verses indicate, if anything, the principle of propriety, in performance—for there were certain things that ought not to have been presented—and some thing to be taught in accordance with the principle of the 'Śāstra', the philosophy.

Not only one finds no clue to anything remotely similar to the principle of causality in the *NS*, the very idea seems entirely foreign to the manual. In fact, there are two verses which run counter to the principle of the need for causality. It is observed,

> A play though, it may be poor as regards its theme will, when furnished with requisite Limbs attain beauty because of the brilliance of production.[10]

What is implied here is the success of a play in performance rather than any anxiety about the actual composition. As has already been discussed, Bharata was

not concerned with the efforts of the poet directly as Aristotle certainly was.

The second verse is in an earlier book devoted to the discussion of the ten kinds of drama. It is said,

> At the conclusion of all the plays which contain various States and Sentiments, experts should always introduce the Marvellous Sentiment.[11]

If a play is destined to be concluded by *deue ex machina*, why bother to introduce the principle of causality at all? In the West, wherever a denouement of this type occurs, it entails endless discussion, largely negative, for it is not possible to reconcile a conclusion at the instance of some interference by a powerful king or gods with the logic of events.

In this context, one might as well contrast the principle of 'probabitity and necessity' found in the *Poetics* with the principle of *Niyati Kaṛta niyama rahitā*.[12] The former imposes an obligation to link the events more carefully, within the framework of the confines of art; the latter seeks to give all license to the poet freeing him from all constraints of credibility, to subject his characters and events to whatever might occur to him.

The Aristotelian concept of drama has. in practice, come to mean drama built around the principle of conflict. The term conflict here means a situation generating

bi–polar action, implying tension and its ultimate resolution in a catastophe or a denouement.

If conflict were to be interpreted as a mere obstacle, any number of examples of conflict could be found in any play whatsoever. Conflict as it to be understood in the context of drama is hardly to be found in Sanskrit drama.

Mrs. Minakshi Dalal has a full length book on this subject, *Conflict in Sanskrit Drama* based on her thesis.

She is certainly not unaware of the implications of the concept of conflict in Western drama. To reproduce some of her quotations

> In every drama, there is a collision of forces. Man is imprisoned within the limits of the actual. Outside him is a necessity wh ch restricts his freedom, a superior power with which his will collides. Again there is the inward discord of his own divided will and further the struggle with other human wills, which obstruct his own.[13]

o o o o

> Here ambitions conflict with ambitions, desire with duties, private with the civic interest or the ideals of yesterday with the ideals of today.[14]

On her own, she paraphrases W. F. Thrall,

> ... the struggle which grows out of the interplay. of oppossing forces in a plot is conflict ... [15]

and goes on to say,

> A student of Sanskrit dramatic theory will not find even in the extensive work of Bharata ... any specific references to conflict. This treatise ... has not once mentioned a major technical term like 'Sangharsha' signifying conflict. Conflict as a vital element in a drama is a concept formed by students of Western dramatic art and theatre.[16]

One wonders whether Mrs. Dalal is really aware of the import of her quotations and her statements. In any case, the Western concept of conflict cannot be applied to any concept of conflict unearthed in a Sanskrit play.

This thesis is just another instance of reading into Sanskrit rama the concepts and principles governing the forms of an alien culture. While some parallels can always be found, as Mainkar[17] does by putting side by side the stages of the progress of the plot in Bharata — the *sandhis* – and those enumerated by Dryden, the protasis, the catastasis and the catastrophe, the paralles — even here – are superficial, and the two sets of terms do not quite imply the same thing even in such a mechanical matter as the stages of the progress of a plot.

VII

Aristotle's principles of 'mimesis' and 'catharsis', of the nature and function of tragedy in particular and drama and art in general, fuse and lead to the concepts of 'plot' and 'unity'.

Whatever interpretation of the term 'mimesis' as

contextualixed by Aristotle one may find convenient to comprehend the relationship of nature and art, it is certain the process of such transformation, both, for the writer as well as for the spectator or the reader can neither be mechanical nor can it be connected with emotion. The Greeks had great faith in reason and therefore the concept of the nature of art would naturally be intellectual.

Since 'catharsis' came to be primarily interpreted as purgation or purification of emotions, it was taken as an emotive counterpart of a theory which had its beginning in the intellect. Even if one were to stick to this and reject the approaches of Else, Heffner and Hardison, Jr. the resultant concept of the 'plot' and the 'unity' implying causality and nexus will have to be regarded as intellectual.

As Archie J. Bahm puts it,

> . . . two traits, Will and Reason, stem respectively from the two main tap roots of Western civilization, the Hebraic and the Greek . . . Greek philosophers, idealizing reason, regarded will as irrational and distrusted it as evil. Reason, as the principle of order, regularity, stability, and eternality in both man and universe, provides the basis for the nature of things and for deductive certainty about them. Faith in the

> discernibility of the forms of things begot ideals of perfect definability, whether as Platonic Ideas, Aristotle's Forms, or the laws of nature or of logic. Will acts rightly only when assenting to reason. In Christian theology, as depicted in the Augustinian synthesis, reason and will are identical in God, who is perfect, but never quite so in man, who is imperfect . . . Persisting opposition between will and reason resulted in recurrent outbreaks of intellectual indigestion in Western thought, not only in theology but also in conflicting aesthetic theories.[1]

In fact, the Westrrn civilization is also an heir to the Christian myth of the distrust of knowledge—reason—as the partaking of the fruit of knowledge led to the expulsion from paradise of mankind's parents.

So the Westerner's inheritance of the Greek attitude to knowledge and reason, was bound to clash with his religious attitude of distrust of knowledge.

In matters of art and literature, in matters of theories and forms at least, the dominance of the Greek trait certainly evident. That the concept of unity in a work of art implying rationality was accepted without question is a case in point. Excepting for the blending of the tragic and the comic—which, in point of theory, is an issue outside the *Poetics*—drama in the West continued to be Aristotelian till the need for a revolutionary change was

felt to express the pressures of the irrational after the two great wars, leading to the theatre of the absurd. As A. P. Hinchliffe puts it, the theatre of the absured would seem to assume that it is "one of the ways of facing up to a universe which has lost its meaning and purpose."[2]

As Aristotle has himself admitted, the concept of unity is also not absolute. He has observed that an epic "can be less unified than . . . tragedy."[3] Not very consciously certainly, but Aristotle, in this respect it seems, was taken at his word, and in the form of the novel which is a direct descendent of the form of the epic we find the 'irrational' getting in right from the beginning. One has only to contast *Tom Jones*[4] and *Tristram Shandy*.[5] Tristram Shandy as narrator does not at all prevaricate. He says,

> I should beg Mr. Horace's pardon–for in writing what I have set about I shall confine myself neither to his rules, nor to any man's rules that ever lived.[6]

What Edwin Muir regards as a dramatic novel is a latter day invention, first produced by Jane Austen. The irrational in the form of the novel thus did not have to wait to make its entry and could be seen stretching to the novels of the yester year, like *Midnight's Children.*[7]

What I have been trying to suggest here is, there is a sort of tightness in the form of drama in the West

from Aristotle to the twentieth century and that this is to be found due to the governing principles of 'plot' and 'unity'. When Dryden sought to modify Aristotle's definition and substituted the term "human nature" for the Aristotelian term "action", and similarly "play" for "tragedy"–"A play ought to be a just and lively image of human nature representing its passions and humours . . ."[8] he was trying to acount for the genius of Shakespeare who had come between him and Aristotle, and was also implying a change of role in the function of a critic, making him a law giver instead of o descriptive, deductive, philosopher, by substituting "ought to be for "is". And yet, Shakespeare too is very much a part of the Western tradition though he substitutes psychology for the logic of events.

For the drama that "ought" really "to be a just and lively image of human nature representing its passions and humours" one must come to Bharata. Bharata thinks of just that, and further, in the place of 'causality', 'nexus', 'unity' which must all relate to the ordering, at the level of the plot, the 'passions and humours of mankind', he gives the audience response theory of the *rasa*, the sentiment, stressing the emotive aspect of literature.

The very need for drama stems from this emotional need of the people, a need for a *Krīḍanīyakam*,[9] an audio–visual diversion which would, to all intents and purposes give them the same type of emotional experience as they were wont to derive from life, only, it would be

impersonal, and therefore more enjoyable, to be comprehended by the mind,[10] to be contemplated instead of being suffered.

This would require a focussing on human nature. At several places in the *NŚ*, Bharata advises that the material for drama should be drawn from human nature.[11]

Such a representation of human nature would have to be weaved into drama by observing the rules regarding the *sandhis,* the linkages, which, as has been shown, do not imply a causal connection. The result, then, would be, what is regarded as an episodic plot, condemned as a fault in drama by a Western critic :

> In order for plot to be effective, it must be whole . . . which can be easily seizrd by the mind. Episodic structures deny this and lead to confusion, obscuring the end the poet has in mind.[12]

But even episodic plots can be so constructed as to convey a unity of impression, only, it must not be confused with the unity of action. Manmohan Ghosh qotes from Bharata on the *sandhis* to show how this unity of impression is to be achieved :

> . . . in the plot of a drama, the playwright had to be careful about the unity of impression which it was calculated to produce.[13]

o o o o

> The Germ (*bija*) of the play as well as its Prominent Point (*bindu*) was always to relate to every Act of the play and the Hero was sometimes to appear in every Act or to be mentioned there.[14]

After all, the play was not to focus on the plot, or the junctures or anything of that sort. They were all to be subordinated to the major concern regarding the *rasa*. There is an impression widely shared that there is some common platform between the theory of catharsis and the theory of *rasa*. Butcher's[15] interpretation of 'catharsis' as the purification of emotions through universalisation was seen to be almost exactly what Bharat must have had in mind in regard to the theory of *rasa* :

> Catharsis is the phenomenon, a sort of metamorphosis, experienced by the audience when they find themselves in *rasa–daśā*, or the state of having realised *rasa* . . . Abhinavagupta found the concept of *sādhāraṇīkarṇa* inherent in the *rasa* theory. *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* means universalisation . . . The peak of *rasa*–realisation is attained when the spectators' ties with their ego are snapped and they find themselves lifted from the plane of their sordid private lives . . . That is what, Aristotle says, tragedy does...[16]

As a much greater scholar of Indian as well as comparative aesthetics, Pravas Jivan Cnaudhury puts it,

> *Rasa* is a realization of one's own consciousness as coloured by emotions," says Bharata The self degnerates as man takes too much real interest in the world and gets involved in it. The mind then loses its native joy and freedom. The remedy is art where the mind is made self-aware and free from any objective necessity . . . This is the cathartic effect of drama and this accounts for the "proper pleasure" spoken of by Aristotle and the "extraordinary charm" by Abhinavagupta.[17]

This similarity between the theory of *rasa* and the theory of 'catharsis', as indicated, holds true of only one interpretation of the erm "catharsis". The other interpretation of "purgation of emotions" has nothing in common with the *rasa* theory. And the 'clarification' interpretation of O. B. Hardson, Jr. does not even refer to the emotive aspect of drama.

Not in point of similarity, for there would be none, but on point of the process of intellection, Pravas Jivan Chaudhury can be found helpful in putting the *rasa* theory and the 'clarification' interpretation side by side :

> ... the contemplative attitude in art has a certain resemblance to the intellectual in science and philosophy. In both there is impersonality or freedom from involvement in the object contemplated and seized ...[13]

It is from this point of view that Hardison, Jr.'s intellection of events can be compared with the intellection of emotions implied in the *rasa* theory.

Apart from the universalization of emotions read into the 'catharsis' clause by Butcher, there is yet another kind of universalisation, non-emotive in character, read into the principle of 'unity' and other allied statements in the *Poetics* by Petra von Morstein, similar to Hardison, Jr.'s interpretation of the 'mimesis' principle. Petra Von Morstein distinguishes between universality, unity and uniqueness Unity is to be understood as th· principle of causality. But art must be founded on concrete models rather than on universals. In this context the use of the term 'universal' in the *Poetics* (Chapter IX) will have to be properly interpreted. Observes Petra von Morstein,

> Both individual persons and individual works of art have constitutive aspects, essential to their individuality rather than to their class membership which do and must preclude conceptualization and generalization.[19]

o o o o

> Universals as represented by works of art are intensional universals, like Kantian Schemata.[20]

o o o o

> Universals, as in the *Poetics*, are neither concepts not can they be fully captured by concepts. I speak of them as *intensional universals,* by contrast with, e.g. 'tables' or 'blue', which are '*extensional universals*'. Again, universals represented by works of art are 'intensional universals.'[21]

The Western literature has always had one of its poles firmly fixed in the real, the concrete. One can see the assumed expectation of the real and the life–like in art even in such a simplistic distinction between the 'round characters' and the 'flat characters',[22] or the individuals and the types. The writer has to begin by the contemplation of the real, the concrete, the world. Not for him Plato's concept of the nature of reality and man's relationship to it. As Plato has put it, Man's perception of nature, reality, is analogous to the shadows the prisoners, chained to a wall in a cave dimly lit by fire, would see on the wall. The reality is outside the cave in the clear, unequivocal light of the sun.[23]

The Western drama, or indeed literature, presupposes a continuous process of contemplating reality, and thus ensures a great deal of variety. In Sanskrit drama the

reality in the form of *vibhāva*, the stimulus is to be weaved into the limited number of the permutations and combinations of the *Vyabhicāri bhāvas* and the *sthāyi bhāvas*, the transitory states and the emotions. Each *sthāyi bhāva* has a fixed number of *Vyabhicāri bhāvas*. As opposed to the intellectual approach of the Western literature—intellectual for the artist who must engage in the philosophical activity of creating unified wholes, intellectual for the spectator of the reader who must comprehend them as such wholes, intellectual for the critic who must interpret, judge and evaluate works on similar principles, on the grounds of sincerity, authenticity, credibility, probability and the like—the stress in Sanskrit drama is wholly on its emotive aspect. The dramatist has to focus not on action but on human nature and has to endeavour to build into his work the passions and humours of mankind, through which the *rasa* would be communicated, which, when perceived, enjoyed and comprehended by the mind, *manasā*, would induce a state of bliss, a movement directed inward towards the contemption of the soul as distinguished from a movement outward towards something divine pursued by the ascetic.[24]

Apart from the term 'catharsis' interpreted as 'purgation' or 'purification' there are no other ancient audience or reader response theories. The agency of the mind as opposed to intellect as the participating agency in the task of creation and appreciation of literature, though not strictly modern, is certainly a later development.

Despite the hints in Kant, and in full knowledge of the theories of Kant, I. A. Richards, as late as 1928,

finds it difficult to accept the notion that an aesthetic experience is something unique :

> All modern aesthetics rests upon the assumption which has been strangely little discussed, the assumption that there is a distinct *kind* of mental activity present in what are called aesthetic experiences. Ever since. . . . Kant, the attempt to define the 'judgement of taste' as concerning pleasure which is disinterested, universal, unintellectual, and not to be confused with the pleasures of sense or of ordinary emotions . . . to make it a thing *sui generis* has continued.[25]

o o o o

> Some activity that was neither inquisitive nor practical, that did not question and did not seek to use. The result was the aesthetic . . . still defined . . . by these negative conditions . . .[26]

o o o o

> . . . Mr. Clive Bell used to maintain the existence of an unique emotion 'aesthetic emotion' as the *differentia*. But psychology has no place for such an entity.[27]

o o o o

> The aesthetic mode is generally supposed to be a peculiar way of regarding things... intended to cover the experience of ugliness as well as ... beauty, and also intermediate experiences. What I wish to maintain is that there is no such mode ... a narrower sense of aesthetic is also found in which it is confined to experiences of beauty and does imply value . . . with regard to this . . . I shall be at pains to show that they are closely similar to many other experiences... not in the least a new and different kind of thing. When we look at a picture, or read a poem, or listen to music, we are not doing something quite unlike what we were doing on our way to the Gallery or when we dressed in the morning.[28]

One really wonders what Abhinavagupta would have made of all this.

Almost echoing Bharata's distinction between the transitory states, the *Vyabhicāri bhāvas,* and the emotions, the *bhāvas,* using terms like 'emotion' and 'feeling', T. S. Eliot, in 1919, writes,

> The experience, you will notice, the elements which enter the presence of the transforming catalyst, are of two kinds: emotions and feelings. The effect of a work of art upon

> the person who enjoys it is an experience different in kind from any experience not of art. It may be formed out of one emotion, or may be a combination of several; and various feelings, inhering for the writer in particular words or phrases or images, may be added to compose the final result. Or great poetry may be made without the direct use of any emotion whatever : composed out of feelings solely.[29]

Eliot recognises the uniqueness of the aesthetic experience and connects feelings and emotions with the writer as well as the reader. A closer examination of the passage will, however, reveal the gulf between the conceptual clarity of Bharata and Abhinavagupta and the problems and risks of grasping and relating, in one ambitious leap, the feelings, the emotions, the work, the writer, and the reader faced by a modern critic.

It is Susan Langer who comes closest to the theory of *rasa*. She is not unaware of the Indian theory[30], but she really does not seem to have explored the similarities between the Indian theory, and what she herself was trying to propound, and see the results in the light of the *rasa* theory. The distinction between feeling and emotion is not clear. But the theory she puts forward is one which takes in the feelings as the starting point of a work of art, which, mediated through the work—which, in this process, would seem to assume the status of a complex symbol—will arouse feelings in the reader/spectator not to be experi-

enced on the same plane as feelings experienced in life, but to be 'perceived'. It is difficult to quote from Susan Langer in support of this bare statement of her position as she herself keeps quoting, on this issue, from an essay "Kunst and Gefuhl" by Baensch interspersing her remarks on the essayist's statements. But one of the long passages she cites is explicit enough :

> . . . I hope to prove that art, like science, is a mental activity whereby we bring certain contents of the world into the realm of objectively valid cognition; and that, furthermore, it is the particular office of art to do this with the world's emotional content. According to this view, therefore, the function of art is not to give the percipient any kind of pleasure, however noble, but to acquaint him with something he has not known before. Art, just like science, aims primarily to be 'understood' . . . But since that of which it makes us aware is always of an emotive character it normally calls forth, more or less peremptorily, a reaction of pleasure or displeasure in the perceiving subject.[31]

This statement of Baensch's can be taken to bridge the gap between the pleasure of 'intellection', a mental, intellectual process read into the 'catharsis' clause by Hardison, Jr., and the *rasa* theory, the purely emotive

aspect of literature. A kind of synthesis between the intellectual pleasure of perceiving the design of an 'action', the 'clarification', and the non–personal enjoyment of the feelings and emotions generated by a performance or a work of art would be ideal and closer to the actual intellection–emotion experience undergone.

VIII

Of the various forms of drama, tragedy is regarded as the highest. Both in theory and practice, tragic drama has enjoyed this position since the times of Aristotle and Aeschylus. That no tragedies comparable to those of the Greek and Elizabethan – Shakespearean

models are being written in the modern times has become a source of lament for many critics. Joseph Wood Krutch,[1] writing on the subject in 1929 not only howled very loud, but also went to the extent of propounding a very strange theory of tragic fallacy, that a balancing between reason and unreason, faith and supernatural, a sense of seriousness and importance of human actions in cosmic context made the composition of the tragedies possible.

Many Sanskrit scholars lament the lack of tragedy in Sanskrit. G. K. Bhat[2] has a book–length study on the subject. The best part of the book is the section where he gives detailed and very valid reasons for the lack of tragedy in Sanskrit. Firstly, he argues that the theory of drama in Sanskrit is anti–tragedy :

> Cannot a tragedy, and the *karuṇa*, *bhayānaka* and *vīra* (pity, fear and the heroic) in it, be aesthetically enjoyed ? The Sanskrit dramatic theory and practice are clearly one–sided. Failure on the part of the dramatists and theorists, both, to grasp the real aesthetics of art appears to be an important reason for the absence of tragedy. It is a failure of aesthetic perspective.[3]

This is indeed very strong language from a learned scholar : "failure to grasp the real aesthetic of art", "failure of perspective". What is implied is no perspec-

tive or aesthetic theory that negates the possibility of tragedy can be considered to be good or complete.

It means the author is forgetting that no literary theory or perspective can exist in a cultural vaccum, that literary theory is always a part of cultural and philosophical heritage. But he isn't. He goes on to list those very philosophical reasons which rule out the possibility of tragedy in Sanskrit :

> It will also not be wholly correct to imagine that the Sanskrit writers had a poor view of life and death, even if they followed certain literary traditions . . . The possibility of compulsive reosons cannot be denied. This must take us to the values of life, religious and philosophical . . . The tragic sense must depend on our acceptance that an individual is free to act, act even wrongly . . . The Indian religion, which belives in a continuity of life through a cycle of births and deaths, assumes that a man's life is, in a way, pre-ordained by his own actions . . . The suffering . . . being the result of his own actions in the previous birth and of his own fully in the present existence, he has no moral right to grumble or grieve over his personal state. This is the law of Karman, and it is inexorable . . . In life, as in literature, the Indian mind is always prone to trace suffering and sorrow to its own fate . . . Fate is only a

> force, created by the accumulation of merit and demerit of one's own actions in previous births.[4]
>
> o o o o
>
> These tenets of religion and philosophy have had a firm hold on the Indian mind. If an artist tried to shake off this hold, his audiences would probably never be able to understand and accept him.[5]

It is the immediacy of death coupled with the problems of choice, possibilities of going wrong and there being one final verdict of heaven or hell at the end of it that sharpen the point of tragedy in the West. But even in the West, in the twentieth century, Joseph Wood Krutch is reduced to explaining the lack of tragedy by a fantastic, though credible theory of the tragic fallacy; and George Steiner[6] to arguing that any action that admits of socio-economico-politico-psychological solutions cannot be accorded the status of tragedy, that the modern problems are essentially such socio-economico-politico-psychological problems and therefore tragedy is dead.

The reasons that G. K. Bhat is enumerating in 1974 echo precisely the reasons advanced more cogently by Keith fifty years before him, in 1924 :

> The emotions . . . it was desired to evoke were . . . strictly limited by the Brahminical theory of life. The actions and status of man in any existence depend on no accident; they are essentially the working out of deeds done in a previous birth, and these again are explained by yet actions from time without beginning. Indian drama is thus deprived of a motif which is invaluable to Greek tragedy, and everywhere provides a deep and profound tragic element, the intervention of forces beyond control or calculation in the affairs of man, confronting his mind with obstacles upon which the greatest intellect and the most determined will are shattered. A conception of this kind would deprive the working of the law of the act of all validity, and, however much in popular ideas the inexorable charactor of the act might be obscured by notions of an age before evolution of the belief of the inevitable operation of the act in the deliberate form of expression in drama this principle could not be forgotten. We lose, therefore, the spectacle of the good man striving in vain against an inexorable doom; we lose even the wicked man whose power of intellect and will made us admire him, even though we welcome his defeat.[7]

After marshalling the reasons for the lack of tragedy in Sanskrit, G. K. Bhat reaches another very strange conclusion, again in very emphatic terms :

> From a purely aesthetic point of view, the absence of a *formal* tragedy is in itself the tragedy of Sanskrit drama; a tragedy that was inevitable.[8]

Carl Jung[9] has tried to explain such fascination for the forms of an alien culture in the times of cultural decadence. The chief reason for much fascination for tragedy in Sanskrit scholars like G.K Bhat and in Western critics like Joseph Wood Krutch is an unquestioned belief in some hierarchical order of forms.

The *NŚ*[10] wisely avoids any such formal division and offers an absolutely neutral one based on the principles of quantity, the number of acts in a play, and content, the subject matter, the raw material. The subjec· matter is the foundation of the three aspects of a play[11] : content, the leader (interpreting the term *netā* literally), and the chief sentiment, the *rasa* generated. A *nāṭaka*[12] will thus extend to seven acts and will have some well-known story for its subject matter, while a *prakaraṇa*[13] will have an original plot devised by the poet and will extend to ten acts.

G. K. Bhat attempts to borrow a label from the forms of Western drama for some of the important

Sanskrit plays and chooses a hybrid : "Serious comedies of love".[14] This is to disregard what Henry W. Wells describes as the "circular motion" of Sanskrit drama :

> . . . Sanskrit playwrights shun tragedy, satire, naturalism, and the particular seriousness and involvement with life that leads to the most convincing character–delineation and to a conviction that some particular problem in life is plumbed deeply . . .many of the qualities which we do actually value most highly in all Western theatrical masterpieces are found in the Sanskrit works together with some which are at once almost unique achievements . . . Indian drama has great aesthetic attraction and many spiritual values . . . [15]
>
> o o o o
>
> The circular motion of separation and return must . . . be conspicuous on even a rapid inspection of the most celebrated Sanskrit plays . . . The "happy ending" of almost all Sanskrit plays operates in this behalf, for where a story falls within the mould of tragicomedy, the action will naturally pass from felicity to misfortune and back to felicity again. Sanskrit criticism itself states that the end of the play should in some way recapitulate its beginning.[16]

Wells's comparison of the forms of drama in the West and the division of drama in the *NŚ* is equally instructive :

> Dramatic theory in India recognizes many types of drama, two of the chief being the *Nāṭaka* and the *Prakaraṇa*. The first is the more exalted . . . The second is less exalted . . . it impinges on naturalism and the comedy of manners . . . the first type stands closer to tragedy, the second to various lighter theatrical forms . . . Both . . . are highly sophisticated . . . the dramatic romance stands somewhere between Western tragedy and the representative *Prakaraṇa*, while the *Prakaraṇa* stands somewhere between Western high comedy and the *Nāṭaka*[17]

In fact, formally, Sanskrit plays come closest to the movement of the last plays of Shakespeare. Wells has already spoken of such a movement, "from felicity to misfortune and back to felicity again". This is common to all the three major last plays of Shakespeare. The phrase 'dramatic romance' first occurs in Hazlitt.[18] There is quite a history of the British resistance to the peculiar beauties of this kind of drama. Dr. Johnson[19] and Bernard Shaw[20] regarded *Cymbeline*, for example, as extremely crude and beneath criticism. It is Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch[21] who recognises the experimental nature

of these romances and concludes that Shakespeare had come to realize that forgiveness is nobler than revenge, and that in the last plays, the great playwright is reaching out to something better than tragedy.

The most enthusiastic of the later critics is E.M.W. Tillyard,[22] definitely of the view that the Shakespearean romance is a step forward, is a higher kind of drama than tragedy:

> In . . . tragedy, two conceptions have stood out in strong opposition the one to the other. The first is the stoical. In this view, tragedy is concerned with resistance to circumstance . . . The other conception . . . includes some sort of reconciliation in the full tragic pattern.[23]
>
> o o o o
>
> . . . one of Shakespeare's main concerns in his last plays . . . was to develop the final phase of the tragic pattern . . .[24]
>
> o o o o
>
> . . . the latest plays aim at a complete regeneration . . .[25]
>
> o o o o

> . . . we find in each [of the last three plays : *Cymbeline, The Winier's Tale, The Tempest*] the same general scheme of prosperity, destruction and regeneration.[26]

Such a transcendence of the tragic pattern also brings in its wake a break–up with the realistic approach.[27] Shakespeare finally crosses over from the realm of psychological and spiritual reality of situation and human nature into the world of pure art. As Joan Hartwig puts it,

> The important impact at the end of each of these tragicomedies is the audience's renewed awareness of art as a focusing agent for reality . . . The world of the actual has been illumined through the illusion, but the audience is nonetheless aware of the difference.[28]

And in view of Hallet Smith,

> These romances are not ritualizing reality; they are hinting at something beyond it – some mysterious music of the spheres.[29]

Formally then, the Sanskrit drama is at a height to which Shakespeare has to climb up through the come-

dies, the tragedies, the histories and the Roman plays. The conscious artificiality, the distinguishing between art and reality, and the sense of completeness are common to the last plays of Shakespeare and the Sanskrit drama : the final step in the same direction, the sophistication through stylization is the privilege of Sanskrit drama only.[30]

Was it not this sense of completeness, this simultaneous vision of heaven and earth found in a translation of *Abhijñānaśākuntalam* that touched Goethe so much ? He rhapsodizes,

> Wouldst thou the young year's
> blossom and the fruits of its decline,
> And all by which the soul is charmed,
> enraptured, feasted, fed,
> Wouldst thou the earth, and heaven
> itself in one sole name combine ?
> I name thee, O Śakuntalā ! and all
> at once is said.[31]
> (E. B. Eastwick translation)

The British insularity is proverbial. If they were so slow to appreciate something of this type nearer home, in Shakespeare, it is no wonder they would pass over Sir William Jones's translation. But the Germans were most enthusiastic. The first article to appear soon after the publication of the German translation in May 1781 was that of Heine. Schiller, Wilhelm Humboldt and many others followed suit. The reverberations of Goethe's verse were heard throughout Germany.[32]

IX

No other dramatist has so far equlled Shakespeare in giving, psychologically speaking, the most convincing portraits of men and women. It is said he has invested his characters with a life of their own.

Under the influence of such living, pulsating crea-

tures, if one were to approach the world of the characters of Sanskrit drama, forgetting even for a short while, that Shakespeare and Kālidasa—for example—were writing different kinds of plays and that theoretically at least, it was possible for Shakespeare to have taken the final step from the world of the romances in general and the artificial world of *The Tempest* in particular, and produce a highly stylized form of drama, to arrive at a point where such a play would have the same atmosphere and appeal as that of Sanskrit drama, the contrast would be very disappointing. Keith, does not refer to Shakespeare, but he does refer to the Greek drama, and finds Geothe's praise "just in a measure", but in the danger of being "pressed further than is justifiable" :

> Limited by the nature of the intellectual movement which produced it, the Sanskrit drama could never achieve the perfection of Greek tragedy or comedy. Kālidasa, greatest of Indian dramatists, experiences no uneasiness at the structure of life or the working of the world. He accepts without question or discon'ent the fabric of Indian society. When Goethe writes of him . . . the praise is doubtless just in a measure, but it may easily be pressed further than is justifiable. For the deeper questions of human life Kālidasa has no message for us; they raised so far as we can see, no question in his own mind . . .[2]

A. B. Gaj-ndragadkar, putting Shakespeare and Kālidasa side by side, finds the Sanskrit poet 'sinking into insignificance' :

> Kālidasa is called the Shakespeare of India. . . . With all due reverence for Kālidasa's memory and admiration for his wonderful genius we must assert that there is no comparison between him and Shakespeare. . . . Kālidasa knew the world. His knowledge of men and women and the workings of their hearts was wonderful. But Shakespeare's knowledge was simply phenomenal. The extensive panorama of characters that he rolls before our vision in his plays, from which no scene of the world seems to be absent, strikes us dumb with admiration. . . . Besides the wonderful variety of Shakespeare's characters, Kālidasa's extremely limited pictures sink into insignificance.[3]

This is a fine illustration of the confusion of premises. If the same criteria, liveliness of characters, the knowledge of the world, were to be applied to Kālidasa, even "His knowledge of men and women and the workings of their hearts was wonderful" is also false, for such is surely not the case. For Kālidasa, working within the tradition of the Sanskrit drama, the representation

of the human nature in drama ordained by Bharata did not have to be interpreted in naturalistic terms. The focus of the theory of drama is on the emotion, and of dramaturgy, on the *nāṭyadharmī*, the stylized action. The characters therefore need not correspond to the men and women of the world. Drama must aim at presenting the typical forms of behaviour, response and emotion only.

Shakespeare created life–like characters. If the actors were to present them on the stage with the same adherence to the realism in enactment, the boundary line between art and life would surely be blurred. This has often happened Many times the spectators have been known to rise in fury against the actors impersonating Othello and Iago. Emilia, Iago's wife acts as a safety valve in Act 5 Scene 2 for the spectator who would have felt like climbing up on the stage and slapping the actor impersonating Othello, but she fails to perform a similar function in respect of the character of Iago.

Another such famous character is Moliere's Tartuffe, recently being played by famous actors like the Rumanian Cotescu[4] and the French, Gerald Depardieu.[5]

Great actors playing such roles have always been proud of their performance when they succeeded in crossing over in the theatre from the world of art and impersonation into life, the auditorium, and some irrepressible spectators seeking to give vent to their disgust and anger, rose up against them.

Shouldn't one remember here that one of the obstacles to the enjoyment of the Sentiment, the *rasa* is

mistaking art for life, is being intoxicated by the beauty of the actress impersonating Śakuntalā ?

Shakespeare seems to be debating for himself this problem of realistic versus non-realisic presentation on the stage. The artisans in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* are baffled by the problem of presenting a play, "The most lamentable comedy, and most cruel death of Pyramus and Thisbe". They face the problem of convincing the audience that the scene occurs by moon light and the lovers talk through a hole in the wall. There is one more problem. If the lion to be impersonated by one of the artisans, roars really like a lion. would not the ladies in the audience be afraid ? Must he then not sound convincing enough, or should some other means of reassuring the audience be found ? How about the actor impersonating the lion himself taking off the costume for a minute and revealing his true identity before he starts roaring ? At a higher level, the same episode highlights problems of presenting, through the medium of a play performed on the stage, the twin contradictory effects of illusion and verisimilitude.[6]

In *Henr V* Shakespeare apologises to the audience for having to represent the mighty English army at Agincourt by

> . . . four or five most ragged foils,
> Right ill-dispos'd in brawl ridiculous,
> The name of Agincourt . . .

and begs the audience to take them as representative of reality :

> Yet sit and see
> Minding true things by what their
> mock'ries be.

So conscious is Shakespeare of the problems of verisimilitude and illusion in the theatre that he introduces a playful chorus standing on the boundary line of irony and seriousness to speak to the audience before the beginning of each act, to take in the scene of each battle, to guide the spectators through the crossing of the channel without offending "one stomach", to

> Piece out our imperfections
> with your thoughts.[7]

In *Hamlet* the delivery of a particular speech is to be put to a special use. Hamlet wishes to prove for himself the guilt of his uncle Claudius, and for this purpose resolves to observe the effect of a play on the uncle. This would require that the play and the acting be as naturalistic as possible. Hamlet therefore asks his players not to overact, not to "tear a passion to tatters, to very rags," to "be not too tame neither, but let [their] discretion be [their] tutor", to "suit the action to the word, the word to the action" and not "o'erstep . . . the modesty of nature".[8]

It is clear Shakespeare takes here the advantage of the general inability to separate art and life in the theatre. But the other two passages cited from *Henry V* aud *A Midsummer Night's Dream* show his consciousness of the problem which no Sanskrit dramatist, thanks to Bharata, ever had to face.

Though Bharat distinguishes between two types of action, the *nāṭyadharmī* and the *lokadharmī*,[9] the stylized and the realistic, it is made clear the latter is to be resorted to most sparingly and only in certain specific situations.

Stylized acting coupled with the most minute details of impersonation through dance-like movements and gestures, dancing and music, and the representation in the like manner of riding a chariot or a horse, or getting off these and so on[10] effectively distanced the life on the stage from the life in the auditorium. Still, it was possible for someone weak of heart, untutored, uninitiated in the almost equally complex art of appreciating and enjoying a play as art experience to fall for the beauty of the actress and forget the impersonation or find it difficult not to get excited over one's own concerns when reminded of them by the enactment of similar episodes on the stage. Abhinavagupta enumerates seven such impediments[11] to the enjoyment of the *rasa*. Drama must never be *anubhāvnam*[12], reproduction on the stage of the response pattern identical to the one practised in life.

The demons mistook drama for life, sought to destroy it, and had to be subdued, and then educated.

The drama, as is related in the *NŚ*[13] is not for the gods, that is, they do not have to devise plays and produce them : they – and the dānavas – are to be regarded as spectators, as perhaps the paradigms of the two extreme classes of spectators.

X

More than a fourth of the NŚ is devoted to music. And drama must also incorporate dance, for, as is described in the account of the origins of drama by Bharata, Brahman had insisted on the inclusion of the *kaiśikī*, the graceful style, and agreed for the purpose, to create

a hundred damsels of divine beauty, the apsarās. As Wells puts it,

> Drama . . . becomes a translation of music into words and action. Poetry is, of course, words without action; the dance action without words; only drama is words–action–music in one, to which is added an imagined spectacle that embraces the quintessence of painting, sculpture, architecture, and decoration.[2]

The dance, the music, the stylized acting effectively distance drama from ltfe. Bharata is very much aware of the problem of mistaking drama for life. In Book I of the *NŚ* he describes how this leads to an attack by the demons on drama. After being subdued, they are educated, a definition of drama as *bhāvānukīrtanam* as distinguished from *anubhāvanam* is also given.

There is a similar quarrel[3] between the gods and the demons about the inclusion of songs in instrumental and the *ālāpa*—the vocalised, rhythmic droning of the composition of musical notes of a particular *rāga*—music. The demons are so pleased with the instrumental and the *ālāpa* music that they refuse to go beyond this. It may be remembered the quarrel occurs in Book V featuring the 'Preliminaries of a Play' in the context of use of music before the beginning of a play. Once again as in the quarrel described in Book I, what was to be kept out was the song featuring the praise of gods.

The gods complained to Nārada, one of the leaders, expert in music, about the choice of the demons, about the demons being pleased only with the *nirgīta*, and requested that it be not allowed to continue.

Nārada replies that the *nirgīta* would so subdue the demons they would not attack the performance, and hence it must be allowed. Bharata then goes on to say, the gods decided to describe this *ālāpa* and instrumental music as *bahirgīta*.

It seems the implications are obvious. Either the demons, pleased with the *nirgīta* would ignore the dramatic performances, or, the *nirgīta* would be one of the continuing features of the whole per formance, and since it pleases them so much, the demons would enjoy that part only. Secondly, the gods would not like to use a term implying negation—*nirgīta* : *niṣkrāntam gitāt*, that from which song has been turned out—and hence sunstituted another, *bahirgīta*, *bahiḥ gītam yasmāt*, that in which there is no song.

The third, more important implication is regarding value judgment. Instrumental and *ālāpa* forms of music are totally devoid of value judgment, and hence the demons would be pleased with this form. Yet another aspect of the same implication is the overall effect of the instrumental and the *ālāpa* music : Bharata uses the term *avabaddhāḥ*[4] literally meaning 'bound down' to describe the spell—binding effect of such music.

Despite the aesthetic distancing ensured by the blen-

ding of music, dance, poetry, and stylization, certain didacticism is not ruled out.

After all, Bharata accords drama the status of the fifth *veda*, an additional source of knowledge, this time, the source of the emotive aspect of knowledge, the knowledge of the behaviour and the response patterns. He goes on to spell out how it teaches duty, love, courage wisdom; how it enlightens the spectators and so on.[5]

Yet, it must be pointed out that philosophically, no amount of didacticism delivered through a spectacle, implied, not addressed directly, constitutes value judgment.

Since Sanskrit drama focuses on human emotion, the best friend of such focusing is music. It is this music *nirgīta, bahirgīta*; that digests didacticism too. As Susan Langer puts it,

> The tonal structures we call "music" bear a close logical similarity to the forms of human feeling . . , of every thing vitally felt. Such is the pattern, or logical form, of sentience; and the pattern of music is that same form worked out in pure, measured sound and silence. Music is a tonal analogue of emotive iife.[6]

XI

Traditionally, the three important aspects of Sanskrit drama are the *vastu*, the *netā* and the *rasa* : the content, the hero, and the sentiment.

Till John Jones published *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy*[2] it was believed that one of the important aspects of

Greek tragedy too was the hero. It was John Jones who laid this ghost to rest by demonstrating that the whole idea of the 'tragic hero' is imported into the *Poetics*. The interpretation of the term 'hamartia' hinges on the conception of the role of the hero. Under the influence of Shakespearean tragedy where the hero has a very significant role to play, 'Hamartia' came to be understood as Achilles's heel, a flaw in an otherwise perfect or near–perfect personality. In the context of the Greek tragedy, 'hamartia' refers to the action and not to the hero and is to be understood as an error of judgment, a result of a misreading of the situation by the prime agent of action.

In Sanskrit drama, the hero must be above blemish, always perfect. The two poles of action in Sanskrit drama are thus the hero and his destiny, destiny in the form of a woman to be acquired, not won over, or a battle to be won. The action precludes conflict because the opposite pole is just the hero's destiny which must be fulfilled. The role of the adversary in case of a battle, or of the woman to be acquired will not be that of an opposing force. The women, as Bharata puts it, are the source of happiness. Since there are many types of women, it is implied, a person would naturally look for more and more of them:

> In this world people always desire happiness
> of which women are indeed the source. These
> women are of various nature.[3]

o o o o

> Austerities are practised for the sake of virtue, (*dharma*) and the (acquisition of) virtue is for the purpose of happiness. And happiness has its source in women the enjoyment of whose company is desired (by people in general).[4]

As Wells puts it,

> Most Sanskrit dramas possess a heroine; in her the passivity, at no time completely absent in the hero, is magnified ten fold. As he is obedient to fate, she is obedient also to him. This is not so much her choice as her destiny as a woman. Conflict between the sexes, a major theme in both the comedy and tragedy of the West, does not exist on the Sanskrit stage. It is scarcely a mis-representation to state that most of the heroines are little more than privileged members of a harem.[5]

The two of the eight on nine sentiments on which a dramatist was supposed to concentrate, then, are the erotic and the heroic.

It is against this tradition of endorsing polygamy and making for only the heroic or the erotic sentiment that Bhavabhūti seems to be raising his voice. In *Mahāvīracaritam* he shows Rama and Sita falling in love at first sight.[6] In *Mālatīmādhavam* he refers to the tradi-

tion of runway marriages and the Gandharva marriages,[7] only to reject them. His hero and heoine are content to pass through a series of vicissitudes, willing to wait for the social sanction. Would it not be proper to understand his introductory boast[8] in this play that he may have to wait for generations to be properly understood, in this light ? The same would be true of his other boast in the same play, "Oh ! What a fine patterning at the hands of destiny !"[9] meaning a consciousness of the newness of his plot construction, a substitution of the newness of his plot construction, a substitution of a causalized, well reasoned plot structure for the traditional episodic structure. He could not have, of course, a similar structure for either the *Mahāvīracaritam* or the *Uttararāmcaritam*.

His rebellion against the comprehensiveness of the erotic sentiment found in Bharata is equally emphatic. For Bharata,

> All the (forty nine) states except indolence, cruelty and disgust are applicable to the erotic sentiment (literally, raise the erotic sentiment by their own name).[10]

Against this, Bhavbhūti, almost repeating the remark, *Aho saṁvidhānakam*[11], which in this context has only a limited meaning — the poet simply compliments himself for thinking up the *Chāya–Sītā* arrangement for the purpose of personal reconcillation of Rāma and Sītā—writes,

> There is only one sentiment, that of Pathos (the Karuṇa), which due to attending causes appears divided and assumes quite various forms, as water assumes the different forms of eddy, bubbles and ripples; in truth, it is all water only.[12]

The basic state of emotion, the *sthāyi bhāva* to which the sentiment of pathos runs parallel is designated as *śoka*, that is sorrow. The debate regarding the uniform pleasurableness of the sentiments is mainly due to the appeal of the sentiment of Pathos, *Karuṇa*. Is *Karuṇa* enjoyable or not ? The commentators are divided on this issue.

In the light of such a controversy, why should Bhavabhūti emphasise that *Karuṇa*, pathos is the only sentiment, and that others are merely different forms of this only genuine sentiment, such as the eddy, the bubbles and ripples are the different forms of water ? Has he in mind something like the relationship of the colour white to the other colours as proved by Newton's wheel, that the colour white is the resultant colour of the mixing of all other colours ?

It may be remembered that *Karuṇa* and *Karuṇā* are derived by the *uṇādi* processing of suffixes, terms that are not to be explained by the normal process of derivation from the root. Efforts are always made to offer some elucidation of such terms by stretching and imagining certain processes of the root and the grammatical

suffixes. The *Vācaspatyam*[13] thus derives *Karuṇa* and *Karuṇā* from Kru and unana. and lists eight contexts in which the terms assume superficially different, but basically similar meanings. One of these contexts refers to the gods or God. One of the attributes of God or gods is *Karuṇā*. The second leads to equating it with mercy, *dayā*. The third gives the statement *Karoti manaḥ ānukulyāya*, that which makes the mind receptive, that is, that which evokes empathy, a state fit to put one's self into somebody else's shoes. The other five contexts and meanings are more or less similar to these three clusters.

Karuṇā is traditionally accepted as one of the chief attributes of God. God is merciful, but his marcy is circumscribed by the limitations of the *Karman* that a suffering soul is heir to. So God, though merciful, all powerful, and willing, must not interfere with the play of *Karman*. All that such suffering, then, would inspire in him would be a profound feeling of *Karuṇā*. It would be a mistake to translate this as pathos. The term is almost untranslatable.

What Bhavabhūti propably has in mind is a sense of *nirveda*, a blending of sympathy and empaty. It might just be possible that what Bhavabhūti intends to communicate by this famous verse is akin to the conception of the *Śānta rasa*, the passages and verses relating to which, in the *NŚ*, are supposed to be interpolations. Abhinavagupta has written at length on the *Śānta rasa*, but it seems he is hardly in a position to reach any definite conclusions.

One of the difficulties in regard to the *Karuṇa rasa* is its relationship with its concomitant *Sthāyi bhāva*, the basic emotional state. The fundamental principle of the *rasa* theory is the peculiar relationship of the *sthāyi bhāva* and the *rasa*. Despite the two being similar to the point of warranting recognition and communication, as well as the implied parallelism, the two are qualitatively different. To bring out this qualitative difference in case of the sentiment of *Karuṇa* and its *sthāyi bhāva* which is *Śoka*, that is sorrow, it is necessary to have an altogether different concept of the meaning of the *Karuṇa*. In the context of the use of the term as an attribute of God, would it not be better to delink it completely from the overtones of *Śoka*, that is sorrow ? This approach would have the twin advantages of facilitating the acceptance of the notion of pleasurability of the *Karuṇa* sentiment and seeing in Bhavabhūti's verse something of value, saving him from the charge of being merely cranky.

In any case, a rebel like Bhavabhūti, too, accepts the primacy of the *rasa* in drama. Of the three, *vastu*, *netā* and *rasa*, the first two belong to the group of components, there being, no doubt, others too besides these two, while the last is the resultant factor—the bridge connecting the components of composition, the components of enactment and the spectator—the intellection of which would constitute the art experience and lead to a state of bliss.

It is this generating of *rasa*, then, that imposes unity on the play and the performance.

The concept of unity in Aristotle leads to a concept of the comprehension of a theme or the configuration of the thematic concerns, an intellectual rather than an emotive process.

From this point of view, the theme or the thematic concerns in Sanskrit drama fall outside the frame of action and characterisation. In Western drama, it is the partial consciousness of the concerns achieved at the level of action, characterisation, and dialogue that leads to anguish and catastrophe in tragedy, and confusion and denouement in comedy. The pattern is completed at the end, for the benefit of the spectator, but a consciousness of the concerns to a great extent is a must.

In Sanskrit drama, since the hero must be above blemish and must succeed in acquiring whatever he is destined to acquire, the larger theme is destiny itself. This concept of destiny differs from the concept of destiny in Greek drama and Shakespearean drama.

In Greek drama, there is always some device—mostly the chorus—to communicate the workings of the ever present destiny. In case of Shakespearean drama, destiny places the hero in a situation where his one weakness would trip him up despite his excellence in all other respects. In Sanskrit drama, destiny is merely the bridging of the gap between the starting point where the hero is poised to acquire what he is destined to acquire and the end when the point of fulfilment is reached. Sanskrit drama, therefore, though it structurally resembles Shakespearean romance, and shows a circular movement, is simply the once or twice or sometimes more

often the missing of the cup and the lip, which, when completed, the end is reached

This is because the characters, action, and dialogue are not thematically connected. Abhinavagupta[14] and following him, Acharya Shri Revaprasad Dwivedi[15] consider the birth of an heir to Duṣyanta as the theme of *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*. Yet, nowhere in the play one can find this operative, that is, nowhere can one find evidence to relate this to the consciousness of the King and Śakuntalā.

Nor is it possible to find textual support in the form of any consciousness on the part of characters revealed through dialogue for the Tagorean thesis that in this play, Kālidasa engages himself to show the [elevation] of love from the sphere of physical beauty to the eternal heaven of moral beauty."[16]

One of the themes of *Uttararāmacaritam* is supposed to be love, but it ceases to be operative after the third act. If the Kingly duties entailing a separation of the King and the queen and their progressive reconciliation with each other, and then, jointly, with the children, the elders, and the society be regarded as the theme of this play, it would too, fall outside the frame of action, characteristion, and dialogue. Moreover, the Indian polity expected a king to override such gossip and punish the culprits rather than succumb to it as Rāma does.

Any enunciation of the theme or the thematic concerns thus tends to fall outside the text; a theme becomes something that does not grow out of the concept

of the unity of action worked out through the components.

In case of the *Prahasanas*, the writers do not seem to take the trouble to even develop and round off the events. With its huge possibilities of comic situations, all undeveloped, not to say unexploited, the *Bhagavadajjukīyam*.[17] from the standpoint of a Western reader is no more than a sketch with some comic dialogues brought to an abrupt end by a writer who has suddenly lost interest in the whole affair.

Several hundred *Prahasanas* written over centuries still await editing and publication. Most of these are believed to be either frankly bawdy, obscence, or downright pornography.

The lack of interest in this stuff on the part of the writer as well as a prospective critic or editor will have to be explained, again, on the grounds of the *rasa* theory : the *Prahasanas*, incorporating obscene material do not generate any of ths *rasas*, but generate a semblance, a mere illusion of the *rasas*, commonly known as the *rasābhāsa*. The content also is supposed to be inappropriate, to be rejected on the grounds of the principle of *aucitya*, that is propriety. The *Prahananas* have thus come to be regarded only as minor diversions, not to be taken seriously, something like the ancient equivalent of the modern blue films which are equally short, pornographic, and inconsequential.

This would certainly not apply to the few good ones that are carefully edited and published. Some of

them, despite the element of the bawdy in them are characterised by fine witty dialogues.

Unfortunately, these few too, like the *Bhagavadaj-Jukīyam*, are, in a sense, incomplete and inconsequential.

XII

The peculiarities of the Sanskrit drama are to be traced to the basic conception of the relationship of art and life. With emotion as its starting point as against the world of objects in the West, the *rasa* theory, perhaps the oldest of the six major schools of aesthetics

in Sanskrit, does impose a certain narrowness, a loosenest of structure, a lack of variety and complexity, and an ignoring of the involvement of the intellect in its comprehension and judgment.

Yet, one must guard against the tendency to regard these peculiarities as the limitations of *S*anskrit drama. They presuppose a philosophical—in the Indian seanse. in the sense of resignation—attitude to life and art.

Bharata insists that a playhouse should be acoustically perfect :[1] the spectator who would sit down to enjoy a dramatic performance in such a playhouse ought also to be perfect.[2] One of the sixty-four arts, that is, the accomplishments of a cultured and civilized person, enumerated by Vātsyāyana,[3] is the ability to enjoy a dramatic performance. This ability is to be translated as a high watermark of sophistication, a knowledge of the art of drama and the production of drama, that is, a knowledge of the gestures of acting and dancing, a knowledge of the art of poetry, and a knowledge of the *Śāstras*, the philosophical texts. Wells therefore rightly points out,

> . . . the Indian theatre, unquestionably one of the highest achievements of Indian art, is the legitimate flower of a refined aesthetic theory and practice . . . The more mature and sophisticated our own aesthetic ideals become, the closar they must lie to the Sanskrit stage.[4]

o o o o

> The entire manner of composition suggests a rigorous choreography.[5]

o o o o

> . . . [the Sanskrit drama] is a celebration of cosmic poise, a highly formal and unmistakably aesthetic projection of life idealistically conceived.[6]

In regard to drama and dramaturgy, the *rasa* theory is generally accepted. Its relationship to the other five major schools of aesthetics is not fully investigated.

These five schools, generally believed to have been, in point of origin, the post–*rasa* schools, are Bhāmaha's school of *alaṅkāra*[7] (figures of speech), Anandavardhana's school of *dhvani* (suggestion),[8] Kṣemendra's school of *aucitya* (propriety),[9] Kuntaka or Kuntala's school of *Vakrokti* (expression excelling the common expression)[10] and Vāmana's school of *rīti* (style or diciion).[11]

In the west, the four counters of the transformation of reality into art and its communication that can be enumerated in their natural order are, the contemplation of the world of objects including human beings/human nature, their representation into art, the comprehension of a word of art, and the pleasure derived from such comprehension.

For the *rasa* theory, their counterparts, six in number, would be, again, in natural order, the observance of

human nature, as well as, by extension, the nature of the gods and the demons; the representation of such nature into a composition; the generating of the *rasa* which would be the overall effect of the spectacle; the comprehension of the *rasa*, the sentiment, on the basis of its running parallel to a life emotion, a basic state, a *bhāva*; the intellection of the *rasa*; and the bliss that is to be experienced by such intellection. Of these six factors, the last four are a matter entirely of an aesthetic-psychological process. The function of a poet, and following him, that of a producer of drama. would be to so compose a text and present it on the stage, that such an aesthetic-psychological process may best be achieved, assuming of course the presence in the auditorium of an ideal spectator, a *sahṛdaya*, a spectator prepared to enter into a state of empathy with the action and the characters.

Viewed in this context all the other five schools of aesthetics seem to refer to the second factor, the stage of linguistic composition only and do not appear to be mutually exclusive. One cannot but be aware of the dangers of such an unqualified. sweeping generalisation, but I do feel a true appreciation of the peculiar nature of the *rasa* theory warrants such a conclusion. An understanding of the linguistic processes pointed up in the other five schools would certainly enhance both, the composition and appreciation, but the supreme concern perhaps must be the generating and the intellection of the *rasa*.

There is hardly any consensus of opinion on the

problem of enlarging the scope of the concepts of 'mimesis', 'catharsis', and '*bhāvānukīrtanam*' to embrace the nature and function of the entire range of literature in the West and in Sanskrit. At the same time, no very serious objections could also be raised to negate their being so considered, as referring to a philosophical/emotive or philosophical/philosophical attitude to the creation and enjoyment of literature in the West; and emotive/emotive attitude to the creation and enjoyment of literature in Sanskrit.

On balance, then, it is difficult to find a common platform for the theory and practice of drama in Sanskrit and in the West. Rather, a true appreciation of the differences should enhance the understanding of Sanskrit drama by the Western audiences.

NOTES

Section I

1. Referred to as the *NŚ* in the rest of the essay. The Book and Verse numbers for the *NŚ* are as given in the English Translation by Manmohan Ghosh, *The Nāṭya-śāstra Ascribed to Bharata Muni* Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1951.

   Appendix I gives the original Sanskrit of the verses referred to. The text for these is as given in The *Nāṭyaśāstra* Volumes I, II and III edited by R.S. Nagar, Parimal Publication, Delhi, 1981–1984.

Appendix II gives the English Translation.

2. *NŚ* I. 14–15. See Appendix I/II.
3. John T. Shipley (Editor), *Dictionary of World Literary Terms,* George Allen and Unwin, 1970.
4. *Oxford English Dictionary.*
5. Alex Preminger (Editor), *Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics* (Englarged Editiod), Macmillan London, 1974.
6. Henry W. Wells, *The Classical Drama of India*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1963.

Section II

1. T. Twining (Translator), *Aristotle's Poetics* (1789); Reprinted in *Aristotle's Poetics and Rhetoric*, J. M. Dent and Sons, London, 1955 (Reprint), p. 27. Quoted by Manmohan Ghosh, pp. xlii – xliii.
2. *Ibid*, p. 17. Manmohan Ghosh, *op. cit.* p. xliii.
3. Leon Golden and O. B. Hardison, Jr. : *Aristotle's Poetics* (Translation by Leon Golden and Commentary by O. B. Hardison, Jr.), Prentice–Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968, p. 23.
4. *Ibid*, Golden, p. 14.
5. Manmohan Ghosh, *op. cit.* p. xlii.
6. *NŚ* XXVII. 88–104; See Appendix 1/II.
7. Manmohan Ghosh, *op. cit.* p. lvi.

8. Aristophanes, *Birds* (Translated by Patric Dickinson), Oxford Univ, Press, Oxford, 1957, p. 37; lines 785–789.
9. H. C. Baldry, *Greek Literature for the Modern Reader*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1960 (Reprint : First Published 1951), pp. 135–136.
10. Manmohan Ghosh, *op. cit.* p. lxviii.
11. Susan *K.* Laager, *Feeling and Form*, Charler Scribner's Sons, New York, 1953, p. 322.
12. Alan Ayckborn, *Sisterly Feelings and Taking Steps*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1981, Preface.
13. E. Martin Browne, *The Making of T.S. Eliot's Plays*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambrige, 1970.
14. Henry W. Wells, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

Section III

1. Richard Lewis Nettieship, *Lectures on the Republic of Plato*, Macmillan, London, 1958 (Reprint : First Published 1897), p. 345.
2. Plato, *The Republic Book X* (Translated by Benjamin Jowett), *The Dialogues of Plato Volume II*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 1953, pp. 469–471.
3. *Ibid*, p. 469.
4. Golden and Hardison, Jr. *op. cit.*, Golden, p. 3.
5. *Ibid*, Hardison, Jr., p. 283.
Proclus was a philosopher of the Neo–Platonic

School, b. Constantinople, 412, d. Athens, 485. (*The Encyclopedia Americana,* Volume 22, 1963).
6. Susan *K.* Langer, *op. cit.,* p. 50.
7. Harvey D. Goldstein, "Mimesis and Catharsis Reexamined", *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism,* Volume XXIV No. 4, Summer 1966, p. 570.
8. Golden and Hardison, Jr., *op. cit.*, Hardison, Jr., pp. 65–66.
9. *Ibid,* Hardison, Jr., pp. 289–290.
10. *Ibid,* Hardison, Jr., p. 290.

Section IV

1. Kenneth C. Bennet. "The Purging of Catharsis", *The British Journal of Aesthetics* Volume 21 No. 3, Summer 1981, p. 212.
2. Golden and Hardison, Jr., *op. cit.,* Golden p. 11.
3. Aristotle, *Politics* 1342 a.
4. Milton, Preface to *Samson Agonistes*, "Of That Sort of Dramatic Poem Called Tragedy". The Purgation Theory is also known as the Milton–Bernays Theory. Jakob Bernays (1824–1881) who subscribed to this view was a German Classical Philologist.
5. S. H. Butcher, *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art,* Revised Edition 1911, Reprinted, Dover Publications, 1951, p. 267.
6. Harvey D. Goldstein, *op. cit.*, p. 573.

7. Gerald F. Else, *Aristotle's Poetics : The Argument* Harvard Univ., Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1957, p..x,
8. *Ibid,* p. 436.
9. *Ibid,* p. 439.
10. Hubert Heffner, Quoted by Kenneth C. Bennett, *op. cit.,* p. 212, foot note no. 2.
11. Golden and Hardison, Jr. *op. cit.* : Hardison, Jr.. pp. 115–117.

Section V

1. *NŚ* I. 7–12. See Appendix I/II.
2. *NŚ* I. 106. See Appendix I/II.
3. *NŚ* After VI. 82. Not in Manmohan Ghosh, believed to be an interpolation. See Appendix I/II.
4. *NŚ* Prose passage between VII. 5 and VII. 6. See Appendix I/II.
5. *NŚ* Books VI and VII.
6. *NŚ* Prose passage between VII. 6 and VII. 7. See Appendix I/II.
7. सर्वत्र प्रत्यक्षविषये ज्ञातुरिन्द्रियेण व्यवसायः, पश्चान्मनसा अनुव्यवसायः ।
8. *K.* C. Pandey, "A Bird's–Eye *V*iew of Indian Aesthetics", *The Journal of Aesthctics and Art Criticism,* Special Issue on Oriental Aesthetics, Fall 1965, p. 69
9. G.B. Mohan Thampi, "Rasa as Aesthetic Experience"

from *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, op. cit.* p. 75.

10. *Ibid*, p. 77.
11. Pravas Jivan Chaudhury. "Catharsis in the Light of India Aesthetics" (First Published, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism,* Volume XV No 2, December, 1956), *The Journal of Aesthetics and Arts Criticism, op. cit.*, p. 155.
12. *Ibid,* p. 156.
13. I am indebted to Acharya Shri Revaprasad Dwivedi of Benares Hindu University, Benares, for this information.
14. Bāṇa : *Kādambarī*, 'Candrāpid's March to Victory'
15. *NŚ* Below VI. 31 :

    न हि रसादृते कश्चिदर्थः प्रवर्तते ।
16. Abhinavagupta, *Abhinavabhāratī*. Abhinavagupta refines the concept of *Sādhāraṇīkaraṇa* offered by an earlier critic, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka. See Appendix III.
17. Recovered by Pramodkumar Patel in *Rasasidhānta : Eka Paricaya* (in Gujarati), University Granthanirmana Board, Ahmedabad. 1980, p. 49.
18. Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's View, accepted by Abhinavagupta.
19. Kālidāsa : *Abhijñānaśākuntalam*, Act, 5, Verse 2 :

    रम्याणि वीक्ष्य मधुरांश्च निशम्य शब्दान्
    पर्युत्सुको भवति यत्सुखितोऽपि जन्तुः ।
    तच्चेतसा स्मरति नूनमबोधपूर्वं
    भावस्थिराणि जननान्तरसौहृदानि ॥

    Translation :

    When on seeing charming objects and hearing sweet sounds, a being although possessed of happiness, be

comes longingly anxious, then, indeed, he remembers in his heart, without consciousness before-hand, friendships of other lives, that are permanent through mental impressions.

The term *bhāvasthirāṇi* may be interpreted with reference to the emotive aspect of personality. One's emotional make up, an ability to be in empathy with the world, may then be regarded as the result of inculcation of culture spread over many existencies.

20. Susan K. Langer, *op. cit.* p. 323.

Section VI

1. Golden and Hardison, Jr. *op. cit*, Golden, p. 12.
2. *Ibid.*
3. *Ibid.* p. 13.
4. *Ibid.* p. 14.
5. *Ibid.* p. 15.
6. *Ibid.* p. 17.
7. *NŚ* Book XXI. See Appendix I/II.
8. T.G. Mainkar quotes Clayton Hamilton, in his book *The Theory of the Sandhis and the Sandhyaṅgas*, Ajanta Publications, Delhi, 1978 (Reprint : The date of the first edition is not given. The thesis was accepted in 1943), p. 181.
9. *NŚ* XXI. 52–53. See Appendix I/II.

10. *NŚ* XXI. 55. See Appendix I/II.
11. *NŚ* XX. 46–47. See Appendix I/II.
12. Mammaṭa, *Kāvyaprakāśa*, Book I, the opening line.
13. Minakshi L. Dalal *Conflict in Sanskrit Drama*, Somaiya Publications. 1973, p. 3.
14. *Ibid*, p. 4.
15. *Ibid*, p. 4
16. *Ibid*, p. 5.
17. T. G. Mainkar, *op. cit.*, pp. 184–185.

Section VII

1. Archie J. Bahm, "Comparative Aesthetics," *The Journal of Aesthctics and Art Criticism, op. cit.*. P. 112.
2. A. P. Hinchliffe, *The Absurd*, The Critical Idiom Series, no. 5, Methuen, London, 1972, p. 11.
3. Golden and Hardison, Jr., *op. cit.*. Golden, p. 52.
4. Henry Fielding, *The History of Tom Jones* (1749).
5. Laurence Sterne, *Tristram Shandy* (1759).
6. *Ibid*, Chapter Iv.
7. Salman Rushdie, *Midnight's Children*, Jonathan Cape, London, 1981.
8. Dryden, *Of Dramatlc Poesy : An Essay*, (1668).
9. *NŚ* I. 14–15. See Appendix I/II.
10. *NŚ* VI. 33. see Appendix I/II.

11. *NŚ* I. 111–112; XXI. 120; XXVI. 126. See Appendix I/II.
12. Elizabeth Dipple, *Plot,* The Critical Idiom Series no. 12, Methuen, London, p. 16.
13. Manmohan Ghosh, *op, clt*, p. xlv.
14. *Ibid.*
15. See Section III.
16. R. L. Singal, *Aristotle and Bharata,* Vishveshvaran-anda Vedic Research Institute, Hoshiarpur, 1977, p. 55.
17. Pravas Jivan Chaudhury, *op. cit.*, p. 158.
18. *Ibid.*
19. Petra Von Morstein, "Understanding Works of Art : Universality, Unity and Uniqueness", *The British Journal of Aesthetics*, Volume 22 No. 4, Autumn 1982, p. 350.
20. *Ibid*,, p. 352.
21. *Ibid* p. 353.
22. E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (1927), Chapter IV.
23. Plato, *The Republic Book VII.*
24. Raneiro Gnoli, *The Aesthetic Experience According to Abhinavagupta,* Oriental Society, Rome, 1956, Pre-face.
25. I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1955 (Reprint : First Published 1924). Chapter II, p. 11.
26. *Ibid*, p. 13.
27. *Ibid*, p. 15.
28. *Ibid*, p. 16.

29. T. S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent", (First Published, *The Egoist*, 1919), *The Sacred Wood*, 1932.
30. See Section V, last paragraph.
31. Quoted by Susan K. Langer, *op. cit.*, p. 19 : Otto Baensch, "Kunst und Gefuhl", *Logos II*, 1923.

Section VIII

1. Joseph Wood Krutch, "The Tragic Fallacy", *The Modern Temper*, Harcourt, Brace and World, 1929; Reprinted in *Five Approaches of Literary Criticism* edited by Wilbur Scott, Collier Books, New York, 1962.
2. G.K. Bhat, *Tragedy and Sanskrit Drama*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1974.
3. *Ibid*, pp. 101–102.
4. *Ibid*, pp. 102–103.
5. *Ibid*, p. 105.
6. George Steiner, *The Death of Tragedy*, Faber and Faber, London, 1961.
7. A.B. Keith, *The Sanskrit Drama etc.*, Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 1954 (Reprint : First Published 1924) pp. 277–278.
8. G.K, Bhat, *op. cit.*, p. 107.
9. Carl Jung, "Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious", *The Collected Works of C, G. Jung* edited by

G. Adler et al translated by R. F. C. Hull, Bollingen Series XX Volume 9 i; Reprinted in *Twentieth Century Criticism* edited by William J. Handy and Max Westbrook, The Free Press, New York, 1974.

10. *NŚ* Book XX. See Appendix I/II.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. G.K. Bhat, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
15. Henry G. Wells, *op. cit.*, pp. 6–7.
16. *Ibid*, pp. 48–49.
17. *Ibid*, pp. 167–168.
18. Hazlitt, *Characters from Shakespeare's Plays*, (1817).
19. Dr. Johnson, *General Observations on the Plays of Shakespeare*, 1756.
20. Referred to by J.M. Nosworthy (Editor), in *Cymbeline*, The Arden Edition of the Works of William Shakespeare, Methuen, London, 1955, p. xl. Nosworthy, besides mentioning Bernard Shaw, Quiller–Couch, Hazlitt, Dr. Johnson, and others gives a brief survey of the attitudes to the last plays of Shakespeare (pp. xl–xlviii), and propounds his theory of "experimental romance" in regard to *Cymbeline* (pp. xlviii-lxii).
21. Sir Arthur Quiller–Couch, *Shakespeare's Workmanship*, (1918).
22. E.M.W. Tillyard, *Shakespeare's Last Plays*, Chatto and Windus, London, 1958 (Reprint : First Published (1918).
23. *Ibid*, p. 16.
24. *Ibid*, p. 20.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
26. *Ibid*, p. 26.
27. See Section IX.
28. Joan Hartwig, *Shakespeare's Tragicomic Vision*. Baton Rouge, Louisiana State Univ., Louisiana, 1972, p. 21. Quoted by Richard A. Andretta, *Shakespeare's Romances*, Vikas, New Delhi, 1981, p. vii.
29. Hallet Smith, *Shakespeare's Romances*, The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, 1972) p. 209. Quoted by Richard A. Andretta, *op. cit.*, p. vii.
30. See Henry W. Wells, p. 142; quoted in Section XII.
31. Quoted by Rabindranath Tagore, "Śākuntala : Its Inner Meaning", Translated from Bengali by Jadunath Sarkar, *Śākuntala* edited by Laurence Binyon, Macmillan, London. 1920, p. xiii.
32. C. C. Mehta, "Sakontala" in a Gujarati Periodical *Sanskriti* No. 412 October–December 1983 pp. 198–200.

Section IX

1. A. B. Keith, *op. cit.*
2. *Ibid*, p. 280
3. A. B. Gajendragadkar (Editor and Translator), *The Abhijñāna–Śākuntala of Kālidāsa*. The Popular Book Store, Surat, (n.d. sixth edition, no date for the first edition either), p. 47.

4. *London Magazine,* Volume 23 No. 7, October 1983, pp. 64–69.
5. *Time,* Volume 123 No. 6, February 6, 1984.
6. See Appendix IV.
7. *Ibid.*
8. *Ibid.*
9. *NŚ* VI. 24. See Appendix I/II.
10. *NŚ* XIII. 88–92, 108. See Appendiv I/II.
11. Abhinavagupta, *Abhinavabhāratī*, See Appendix III.
12. *NŚ* I. 106. See Appendiv I/II.

Section X

1. *NŚ* I. 42–47. See Appendix I/II.
2. Henry W. Wells, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
3. *NŚ* V. 30-44. See Appendix I/II.
4. *NŚ* V. 40. See Appendiv I/II.
5. *NŚ* I. 108–109, See Appendix I/II.
6. Susan K. Langer, *cp. cit.*, p. 27.

Section XI

1. Dhanañjaya, *Daśarūpaka*, I.II. a.:
वस्तु नेता रसस्तेषां भेदकः ।
2. John Jones, *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy,* Chatto and Windus, London, 1962, p. 13 :

"Not merely has the importance which certain Romantic–sounding themes had for Aristotle been exaggerated; a much more serious consideration is our silent and innocent perverting of his book's main argument. I mean that we have imported the tragic hero into *Poetics*, where the concept has no place."

3. *NŚ* XXIV. 98. See Appendix I/II.
4. *NŚ* XXIV. 146–147. See Appendix I/II
5. Henry W. Wells, *op. cit.*, pp. 83–84.
6. Bhavabhūti, *Mahāvīracaritam,* Act I Verse 21 :

उत्पत्तिर्देवयजनाद् ब्रह्मवादी नृपः पिता ।
सुप्रसन्नोज्ज्वला मूर्तिरस्यां स्नेहं करोति मे ॥

Rama : Her beauty, the status of her father as a king and a great scholar, her divine birth—all this impel me to love her.

7. Bhavabhūti; *Mālatīmādhavam,* Act 2 :

अयि सरले, किमद्य मया भगवत्या शक्यम् । प्रभवति प्रायः कुमारीणां जनयिता दैवं च । यच्च किल कौशिकी शकुन्तला दुष्यन्तमप्सराः पुरूरवसं चमक उर्वशीत्याख्यानविद आचक्षते, वासवदत्ता च पित्रा संजयाय राज्ञे दत्तमात्मानमुदयनाय प्रायच्छदित्यादि, तदपि साहसाभासमित्यनुपदेष्टव्य एवायमर्थः सर्वथा ॥

Free Translation :

O you straight forward one ! What could I do now ? Mostly, the virgins are ruled over by their fathers and their destiny. Yet, as the writers have made tales, Viśvāmitra's daughter. Śakuntalā offered her love to Duṣyanta; and the divine damsel, Urvaśi,

offered her love to the mortal Purūravā. And though, the father had promised the King Sañjaya to give him his daughter, this same daughter Vāsavadattā gave herself to Udayana. All this is rashness, so much so, one need not even specifically counsel against it.

8. Bhavabhūti, *Mālatīmādhavam*, Act I Verse 6 :

ये नाम केचिदिह नः प्रथयन्त्यवज्ञां
जानन्ति ते किमपि तान्प्रति नैष यत्नः ।
उत्पत्स्यते मम तु कोऽपि समानधर्मा
कालो ह्ययं निरवधिर्विपुला च पृथ्वी ॥

Free Translation :

My efforts are not for the benefit of those who are supposed to know something, and who spread their hatred against me. But I feel confident that the earth is large and the time is endless; and some day some one will come up who would understand me.

9. *Ibid* Act VI :

अहो सरसरमणीयता संविधानस्य ।

10. *NŚ* VII 108. See Appendix I/II.

11. Bhavabhūti, *Uttararāmacaritam*, Act III :
"Oh, what a concourse of event !"

12. *Ibid* Act 3 Verse 47.

13. Taranatha Tarkavachaspati, (Compiler), *Vācaspatyam*. Volume III, Chowkambha Sanskrit Series, Varanasi, 1982. p. 1700.

14. *Abhinavabhārati*.

15. Revaprasad Dwivedi (Editor), *Kālidāsa Granthāvali*, Benares Hindu University, Varanasi, 1976, p. 432, foot note 1 :

एतदेव शाकुन्तलस्य प्रयोजनमिति वयम् , अभिनव-भारत्याम् (ना० शा० १९।२२ इत्यत्र) अभिनवगुप्तश्च ॥

"The point of the play (*Abhijñānaśākuntalam*) is the birth of a powerful heir to Duṣyanta. This is what Abhinavagupta believes and I agree with him."

16. Rabindranath Tagore, "Sakuntala : Its inner Meaning", Translated by Jadunath Sarkar, *Sakuntala* edited by Laurence Binyon, Macmillan, London, 1920, p. XV.

17. This farce features the companionship of an ascetic guru and his disciple. In a garden they come upon a prostitute who dies by a serpent bite. The guru, in order to prove a point, that the soul is immortal and hence one must not be sorry over death, makes his soul enter the body of the prostitute. Soon after the god of death sends back the prostitute's soul with a lifeless messenger, as it was some other prostitute's time to die. The messenger finding the prostitute very much alive has no alternative but that of putting her soul into the Guru's lifeless body. Both of them now behave according to their normal temperaments which ill accord with their bodies. The only comic situation is the presence of an incompetent physician trying to mend the matters. Soon after, the messenger of the God of death intervenes and switches back the souls to their original bodies.

    The title refers to the combination of the guru and the prostitute. Obviously, the beginning opens up

infinite possibilities for the further progressing of action and comic situations, which any writer would have loved to exploit. He just could not have resisted doing so. But here the souls are switched back, alas, too soon.

Section XII

1. *NŚ* II. 7–8; 18–19; 80–82. See Appendix I/II.
2. Avadhoot Hardikar, "*Prekṣaka* : A Spectator", *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*, 1983, published February 1984, pp. 191–196.
3. *Kāmaśāstra*, Adhikaraṇa – 1, Adhyāya–3, "Vidyāsamuddeśa prakaraṇam", नाटकाख्यादिकादर्शनम्
4. Henry W. Wells, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
5. *Ibid*, p. 16.
6. *Ibid*, p. 43.
7. *Kāvyālaṅkāra* (6th century A. D.)
8. *Dhvanyāloka* (9th century A.D.)
9. *Aucityavicāracarcā* (11th century A.D.)
10. *Vakroktijivita* (10th century A.D.)
11. *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti* (8th century A.D.)

APPENDIX I

The Nāṭyaśāstra edited by R. S. Nagar, Parimal Publication, Delhi 1981–1984

प्रथमोऽध्यायः

7 to 12

भवद्भिः शुचिभिर्भूत्वा तथाऽवहितमानसैः ।
श्रूयतां नाट्यवेदस्य सम्भवो ब्रह्मनिर्मितः ॥
पूर्वं कृतयुगे विप्रा वृत्ते स्वायम्भुवेऽन्तरे ।
त्रेतायुगेऽथ सम्प्राप्ते मनोर्वैवस्वतस्य तु ॥
ग्राम्यधर्मप्रवृत्ते तु कामलोभवशं गते ।
ईर्ष्याक्रोधादिसंमूढे लोके सुखितदुःखिते ॥

देवदानवगन्धर्वयक्षरक्षोमहोरगैः ।
जम्बूद्वीपे समाक्रान्ते लोकपालप्रतिष्ठिते ॥
महेन्द्रप्रमुखैर्देवैरुक्तः किल पितामहः ।
क्रीडनीयकमिच्छामो दृश्यं श्रव्यं च यद्भवेत् ॥
न वेदव्यवहारोऽयं संश्राव्यः शूद्रजातिषु ।
तस्मात्सृजापरं वेदं पञ्चमं सार्ववर्णिकम् ॥

14 to 15

धर्म्यमर्थ्यं यशस्यं च सोपदेश्यं ससङ्ग्रहम् ।
भविष्यतश्च लोकस्य सर्वकर्मानुदर्शकम् ॥
सर्वशास्त्रार्थसम्पन्नं सर्वशिल्पप्रवर्तकम् ।
नाट्याख्यं पञ्चमं वेदं सेतिहासं करोम्यहम् ॥

21 to 22

तच्छ्रुत्वा वचनं शक्रो ब्रह्मणा यदुदाहृतम् ।
प्राञ्जलिः प्रणतो भूत्वा प्रत्युवाच पितामहम् ॥
ग्रहणे धारणे ज्ञाने प्रयोगे चास्य सत्तम ।
अशक्ता भगवन् देवा अयोग्या नाट्यकर्मणि ॥

42 to 47a

परिगृह्य प्रणम्याथ ब्रह्मा विज्ञापितो मया ।
अथाह मां सुरगुरुः कैशिकीमपि योजय ॥
यच्च तस्याः क्षमं द्रव्यं तद्ब्रूहि द्विजसत्तम ।
एवं तेनास्म्यभिहितः प्रत्युक्तश्च मया प्रभुः ॥
दीयतां भगवन्द्रव्यं कैशिक्याः सम्प्रयोजकम् ।
नृत्ताङ्गहारसम्पन्ना रसभावक्रियात्मिका ॥
दृष्टा मया भगवतो नीलकण्ठस्य नृत्यतः ।
कैशिकी श्लक्ष्णनेपथ्या शृङ्गाररससम्भवा ॥

अशक्या पुरुषैः सा तु प्रयोक्तुं स्त्रीजनादृते ।
ततोऽसृजन्महातेजा मनसाऽप्सरसो विभुः ॥
नाट्यालङ्कारचतुराः प्रादान्मह्यं प्रयोगतः ।

107 to 112

नैकान्ततोऽत्र भवतां देवानां चानुभावनम् ।
त्रैलोक्यस्यास्य सर्वस्य नाट्यं भावानुकीर्तनम् ॥
क्वचिद्धर्मः क्वचित्क्रीडा क्वचिदर्थः क्वचिच्छमः ।
क्वचिद्धास्यं क्वचिद्युद्धं क्वचित्कामः क्वचिद्वधः ॥
धर्मो धर्मप्रवृत्तानां कामः कामोपसेविनाम् ।
निग्रहो दुर्विनीतानां विनीतानां दमक्रिया ॥
क्लीबानां धार्ष्ट्यजननमुत्साहः शूरमानिनाम् ।
अबुधानां विबोधश्च वैदुष्यं विदुषामपि ॥
ईश्वराणां विलासश्च स्थैर्यं दुःखार्दितस्य च
अर्थोपजीविनामर्थो धृतिरुद्विग्नचेतसाम् ॥
नानाभावोपसम्पन्नं नानावस्थान्तरात्मकम् ।
लोकवृत्तानुकरणं नाट्यमेतन्मया कृतम् ॥

द्वितीयोऽध्यायः

7 to 8

इह प्रेक्षागृहं दृष्ट्वा धीमता विश्वकर्मणा ।
त्रिविधः सन्निवेशश्च शास्त्रतः परिकल्पितः ॥
विकृष्टश्चतुरश्रश्च त्र्यश्रश्चैव तु मण्डपः ।
तेषां त्रीणि प्रमाणानि ज्येष्ठं मध्यं तथाऽवरम् ॥

18 to 19

अत ऊर्ध्वं न कर्तव्यः कर्तृभिर्नाट्यमण्डपः ।
यस्मादव्यक्तभावं हि तत्र नाट्यं व्रजेदिति ॥
मण्डपे विप्रकृष्टे तु पाठ्यमुच्चारितस्वरम् ।
अनिस्सरणधर्मत्वाद्विस्वरत्वं भृशं व्रजेत् ॥

80 to 82

कोणं वा सप्रतिद्वारं द्वारविद्धं न कारयेत् ।
कार्यः शैलगुहाकारो द्विभूमिर्नाट्यमण्डपः ॥
मन्दवातायनोपेतो निर्वातो धीरशब्दवान् ।
तस्मान्निवातः कर्तव्यः कर्तृभिर्नाट्यमण्डपः ॥
गम्भीरस्वरता येन कुतपस्य भविष्यति ।
भित्तिकर्मविधिं कृत्वा भित्तिलेपं प्रदापयेत् ॥

पञ्चमोऽध्यायः

30 to 44

अतः पर प्रवक्ष्यामि ह्याश्रावणविधिक्रियाम् ।
बहुगीतविधौ सम्यगुत्पत्तिं कारणं तथा ॥
चित्रदक्षिणवृत्तौ तु सप्तरूपे प्रवर्तिते ।
सोपोहने सनिर्गीते देवस्तुत्यभिनन्दिते ॥
नारदाद्यैस्तु गन्धर्वैः सभायां देवदानवाः ।
निर्गीतं श्राविताः सम्यग्लयतालसमन्वितम् ॥
तच्छ्रुत्वा तु सुखं गानं देवस्तुत्यभिनन्दितम् ।
अभवन्क्षुभिताः सर्वे मात्सर्याद्दैत्यराक्षसाः ॥

सम्प्रधार्य च तेऽन्योन्यमित्यवोचन्नवस्थिताः ।
निर्गीतं तु सवादित्रमिदं गृह्णीमहे वयम् ॥
सप्तरूपेण सन्तुष्टा देवा कर्मानुकीर्तनात् ।
वयं गृह्णीम निर्गीतं तुष्यामोऽत्रैव सर्वदा ॥
ते तत्र तुष्टा दैत्यास्तु साधयन्ति पुनः पुनः ।
रुष्टाश्चापि ततो देवाः प्रत्यभाषन्त नारदम् ॥
एते तुष्यन्ति निर्गीते दानवाः सह राक्षसैः ।
प्रणश्यतु प्रयोगोऽयं कथं वा मन्यते भवान् ॥
देवानां वचनं श्रुत्वा नारदो वाक्यमब्रवीत् ।
धातुवाद्याश्रयकृतं निर्गीतं मा प्रणश्यतु ॥
किन्तूपोहनसंयुक्तं धातुवाद्यविभूषितम् ।
भविष्यतीदं निर्गीतं सप्तरूपविधानतः ॥
निर्गीतेनावबद्धाश्च दैत्यदानवराक्षसाः ।
न क्षोभं न विघातं च करिष्यन्तीह तोषिताः ॥
एवं निर्गीतमेतत्तु दैत्यानां स्पर्धया द्विजाः ।
देवानां बहुमानेन बहिर्गीतमिति स्मृतम् ॥
धातुभिश्चित्रवीणायां गुरुलाध्वक्षरान्वितम् ।
वर्णालङ्कारसंयुक्तं प्रयोक्तव्यं बुधैरथ ॥
निर्गीतं गीयते यस्मादपदं वर्णयोजनात् ।
असूयया च देवानां बहिर्गीतमिदं स्मृतम् ॥
निर्गीतं यन्मया प्रोक्तं सप्तरूपसमन्वितम् ।
उत्थापनादिकं यच्च तस्य कारणमुच्यते ॥

षष्ठोऽध्यायः

15 to 24

शृङ्गारहास्यकरुणा रौद्रवीरभयानकाः ।
बीभत्साद्भुतसंज्ञौ चेत्यष्टौ नाट्ये रसाः स्मृताः ॥
एते ह्यष्टौ रसाः प्रोक्ता द्रुहिणेन महात्मना ।
पुनश्च भावान्वक्ष्यामि स्थायिसञ्चारिसत्त्वजान् ॥
रतिर्हासश्च शोकश्च क्रोधोत्साहौ भयं तथा ।
जुगुप्सा विस्मयश्चेति स्थायिभावाः प्रकीर्तिताः ॥
निर्वेदग्लानिशङ्काख्यास्तथासूया मदः श्रमः ।
आलस्यं चैव दैन्यं च चिन्ता मोहः स्मृतिर्धृतिः ॥
व्रीडा चपलता हर्ष आवेगो जडता तथा ।
गर्वो विषाद औत्सुक्यं निद्रापस्मार एव च ॥
सुप्तं विबोधोऽमर्षश्चाप्यवहित्थमथोग्रता ।
मतिर्व्याधिस्तथोन्मादस्तथा मरणमेव च ॥
त्रासश्चैव वितर्कश्च विज्ञेया व्यभिचारिणः ।
त्रयस्त्रिंशदमी भावाः समाख्यातास्तु नामतः ॥
स्तम्भः स्वेदोऽथ रोमाञ्चः स्वरभङ्गोऽथ वेपथुः ।
वैवर्ण्यमश्रुप्रलय इत्यष्टौ सात्त्विकाः स्मृताः ॥
आङ्गिको वाचिकश्चैव ह्याहार्यः सात्त्विकस्तथा ।
चत्वारोऽभिनया ह्येते विज्ञेया नाट्यसंश्रयाः ॥
लोकधर्मी नाट्यधर्मी धर्मीति द्विविधः स्मृतः ।
भारती सात्वती चैव कैशिक्यारभटी तथा ॥

31 to 35

एवमेषोऽल्पसूत्रार्थो निर्दिष्टो नाट्यसंग्रहः ।
अतः पर प्रवक्ष्यामि सूत्रग्रन्थविकल्पनम् ॥

तत्र रसानेव तावदादावभिव्याख्यास्यामः ।
न हि रसादृते कश्चिदर्थः प्रवर्तते ।

तत्र विभावानुभावव्यभिचारिसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः । को दृष्टान्तः । अत्राह–यथा हि नानाव्यञ्जनौषधिद्रव्यसंयोगाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः तथा नानाभावोपगमाद्रसनिष्पत्तिः । यथा हि-गुणादिभिर्द्रव्यव्यञ्जनैरौषधिभिश्च षाडवादयो रसा निर्वर्त्यन्ते तथा नानाभावोपगता अपि स्थायिनो भावा रसत्वमाप्नुवन्तीति । अत्राह–रस इति कः पदार्थः । उच्यते–आस्वाद्यत्वात् । कथमास्वाद्यते रसः । यथा हि नानाव्यञ्जनसंस्कृतमन्नं भुञ्जाना रसानास्वादयन्ति सुमनसः पुरुषा हर्षादींश्च अधिगच्छन्ति तथा नानाभावाभिनयव्यञ्जितान् वागङ्गसत्त्वोपेतान् स्थायिभावा–नास्वादयन्ति सुमनसः प्रेक्षकाः हर्षादींश्चाधिगच्छन्ति तस्मान्नाट्यरसा इत्यभिव्याख्याताः । अत्रानुवंश्यौ श्लोकौ भवतः—

यथा बहुद्रव्ययुतैर्व्यञ्जनैर्बहुभिर्युतम् ।
आस्वादयन्ति भुञ्जाना भक्तं भक्तविदो जनाः ॥
भावाभिनयसंबद्धान्स्थायिभावांस्तथा बुधाः ।
आस्वादयन्ति मनसा तस्मान्नाट्यरसाः स्मृताः ॥

अत्राह–किं रसेभ्यो भावानामभिनिर्वृत्तिरुताहो भावेभ्यो रसानामिति । केषाञ्चिन्मतं परस्परसम्बन्धादेशामभिनिर्वृत्तिरिति । तन्न । कस्मात् । दृश्यते हि भावेभ्यो रसानामभिनिर्वृत्तिर्न तु रसेभ्यो भावानामभिनिर्वृत्तिरिति । भवन्ति चात्र श्लोकाः—

नानाभिनयसम्बद्धान्भावयन्ति रसानिमान् ।
यस्मात्तस्मादमी भावा विज्ञेया नाट्ययोक्तृभिः ॥

नानाद्रव्यैर्बहुविधैर्व्यञ्जनं भाव्यते यथा ।
एवं भावा भावयन्ति रसानभिनयैः सह ॥

सप्तमोऽध्यायः

Beginning to before 7

भावानिदानीं व्याख्यास्यामः । अत्राह–भावा इति कस्मात् । किं भवन्तीति भावाः किं वा भावयन्तीति भावाः । उच्यते-वागङ्गसत्त्वोपेतान्काव्यार्थान् भावयन्तीति भावा इति॥ भू इति करणे धातुस्तथा च भावितं कृतमित्यनर्थान्तरम् । लोकेऽपि च प्रसिद्धम् । अहो ह्यनेन गन्धेन रसेन वा सर्वमेव भावितमिति । तच्च व्याप्त्यर्थम् । श्लोकाश्चात्र––

विभावेनाहृतो योऽर्थो ह्यनुभावैस्तु गम्यते ।
वागङ्गसत्त्वाभिनयैः स भाव इति संज्ञितः ॥
वागङ्गमुखरागेण सत्त्वेनाभिनयेन च ।
कवेरन्तर्गतं भावं भावयन्भाव उच्यते ॥
नानाभिनयसंबद्धान्भावयन्ति रसानिमान् ।
यस्मात्तस्मादमी भावा विज्ञेया नाट्ययोक्तृभिः ॥

अथ विभाव इति कस्मात् । उच्यते–विभावो विज्ञानार्थः । विभावः कारणं निमित्तं हेतुरिति पर्यायाः । विभाव्यन्तेऽनेन वागङ्गसात्त्वाभिनया इत्यतो विभावः । यथा विभावितं विज्ञातमित्यनर्थान्तरम् ।

अत्र श्लोकः—

बहवोऽर्था विभाव्यन्ते वागङ्गाभिनयाश्रयाः ।
अनेन यस्मात्तेनायं विभाव इति संज्ञितः ॥

अथानुभाव इति कस्मात् । उच्यते ।
अनुभाव्यतेऽनेन वागङ्गसत्त्वकृतोऽभिनय इति ।

अत्र श्लोकः--वागङ्गाभिनयेनेह यतस्त्वर्थोऽनुभाव्यते ।
शाखाङ्गोपाङ्गसंयुक्तस्त्वनुभावस्ततः स्मृतः ॥

एवं ते विभावानुभावसंयुक्ता भावा इति व्याख्याताः । अतो ह्येषां भावानां सिद्धिर्भवति । तस्मादेषां भावानां विभावानु-भावसंयुक्तानां लक्षणनिदर्शनान्यभिव्याख्यास्यामः । तत्र विभावानुभावौ लोकप्रसिद्धौ । लोकस्वभावानुगतत्वाच्च तयोर्लक्षणं नोच्यतेऽतिप्रसङ्गनिवृत्त्यर्थम् । भवति चात्र श्लोकः—

लोकस्वभावसंसिद्धा लोकयात्रानुगामिनः ।
अनुभावा विभावाश्च ज्ञेयास्त्वभिनये बुधैः ॥

तत्राष्टौ भावाः स्थायिनः । त्रयस्त्रिंशद्व्यभिचारिणः । अष्टौ सात्विका इति भेदाः । एवमेते काव्यरसाभिव्यक्तिहेतवः एकोन पञ्चाशद्भावाः प्रत्यवगन्तव्याः । एभ्यश्च सामान्य-गुणयोगेन रसा निष्पद्यन्ते ॥

108 to 109

एकोनपञ्चाशदिमे यथावद्भावास्त्र्यवस्था गदिता मयेह ।
भूयश्च ये यत्र रसे नियोज्यास्तान् श्रोतुमर्हन्ति च विप्र-मुख्याः ॥

आलस्यौग्र्यजुगुप्साख्यैरेवं भावैस्तु वर्जिताः ।
उद्भावयन्ति श्रृंगारं सर्वे भावाः स्वसंज्ञया ॥

द्वादशोऽध्यायः

88 to 92 & 108

(Book XIII in Ghosh)

भूमौ विसर्पितैः पादैर्हस्तैर्मार्गप्रदर्शिभिः ।
रथस्थस्यापि कर्तव्या गतिश्चूर्णपदैरथ ॥
समपादं तथा स्थानं कृत्वा रथगतिं व्रजेत् ।
धनुर्गृहीत्वा चैकेन तथा चैकेन कूबरम् ॥
सूतश्चास्य भवेदेवं प्रतोदप्रग्रहाकुलः ।
वाहनानि विचित्राणि कर्तव्यानि विभागशः ॥
द्रुतैश्चूर्णपदैश्चैव गन्तव्यं रङ्गमंडले ।
विमानस्थस्य कर्तव्या ह्येषैव स्यन्दिनी गतिः ॥
आरोढुमुद्वहेद् गात्रं किञ्चित् स्यादुन्मुखस्थितम् ।
अस्यैव वैपरीत्येन कुर्याच्चाप्यवरोहणम् ॥
प्रग्रहग्रहणाद्यानमेवमेवापरेष्वपि ।
अश्वयाने गतिः कार्या वैशाखस्थानकेन तु ॥

अष्टादशोध्यायः

1 to 11

(Book XX in Ghosh)

वर्तयिष्याम्यहं विप्रा ! दशरूपविकल्पनम् ।
नामतः कर्मतश्चैव प्रयोगतः ॥

नाटकं सप्रकरणमङ्को व्यायोग एव च ।
भाणः समवकारश्च वीथी प्रहसनं डिमः ॥
ईहामृगश्च विज्ञेया दशेमे नाट्यलक्षणे ।
एतेषां लक्षणमहं व्याख्यास्याम्यनुपूर्वशः ॥
सर्वेषामेव काव्यानां मातृका वृत्तयः स्मृताः ।
आभ्यो विनिसृतं ह्येतद्दशरूपं प्रयोगतः ॥
जातिभिः श्रुतिभिश्चैव स्वरा ग्रामत्वमागताः ।
यथा तथा वृत्तिभेदैः काव्यबन्धा भवन्ति हि
ग्रामौ पूर्णस्वरौ द्वौ तु यथा वै षड्जमध्यमौ ।
सर्ववृत्तिविनिष्पन्नं काव्यबन्धौ तथा त्विमौ ॥
ज्ञेयं प्रकरणं चैव तथा नाटकमेव च ।
सर्ववृत्तिविनिष्पन्नं नानाबन्धसमाश्रयम् ॥
वीथी समवकारश्च तथेहामृग एव च ।
उत्सृष्टिकाङ्को व्यायोगो भाणः प्रहसनं डिमः ॥
कैशिकीवृत्तिहीनानि रूपाण्येतानि कारयेत् ।
अत ऊर्ध्वं प्रवक्ष्यामि काव्यबन्धविकल्पनम् ॥
प्रख्यातवस्तुविषयं प्रख्यातोदात्तनायकं चैव ।
राजर्षिवंश्यचरितं तथैव दिव्याश्रयोपेतम् ॥
नानाविभूतिभिर्युतमृद्धिविलासादिभिर्गुणैश्चैव ।
अङ्कप्रवेशकाढ्यं भवति हि तन्नाटकं नाम ॥

43
(Book XX *46–67* in Ghosh)

सर्वेषां काव्यानां नानारसभावयुक्तियुक्तानाम् ॥
निर्वहणे कर्तव्यो नित्यं हि रसोऽद्भुतस्तज्ज्ञैः ॥

एकोनविंशोऽध्यायः

1 to 17

(Book XXI in Ghosh)

इतिवृत्तं तु नाट्यस्य शरीरं परिकीर्तितम् ।
पञ्चभिः सन्धिभिस्तस्य विभागः संप्रकल्पितः ॥
इतिवृत्तं द्विधा चैव बुधस्तु परिकल्पयेत् ।
आधिकारिकमेकं स्यात् प्रासङ्गिकमथापरम् ॥
यत्कार्यं हि फलप्राप्त्या सामर्थ्यात्परिकल्पयते ।
तदाधिकारिकं ज्ञेयमन्यत्प्रासङ्गिकं विदुः ॥
कारणात्फलयोगस्य वृत्तं स्यादाधिकारिकम् ।
तस्योपकरणार्थं तु कीर्त्यते ह्यानुषङ्गिकम ॥
कवेः प्रयत्नान्नेतृणां युक्तानां विध्युपाश्रयात् ।
कल्प्यते हि फलप्राप्तिः समुत्कर्षात्फलस्य च ॥
[लौकिकी सुखदुःखाख्या यथावस्था रसोद्भवा ।
दशधा मन्मथावस्था व्यवस्थात्रिविधा मता ॥]
संसाध्ये फलयागे तु व्यापारः कारणस्य यः ॥
तस्यानुपूर्व्या विज्ञेयाः पञ्चावस्थाः प्रयोक्तृभिः ॥
प्रारम्भश्च प्रयत्नश्च तथा प्राप्तेश्च संभवः ।
नियता च फलप्राप्तिः फलयोगश्च पञ्चमः ॥
औत्सुक्यमात्रबन्धस्तु यद्बीजस्य निबध्यते ।
महतः फलयोगस्य स फलारम्भ इष्यते ।
अपश्यतः फलप्राप्ति व्यापारो यः फलं प्रति ।
परं चौत्सुक्यगमनं स प्रयत्नः प्रकीर्तितः ॥

ईषत्प्राप्तिर्यदा काचित्फलस्य परिकल्पते ।
भावमात्रेण तं प्राहुर्विधिज्ञाः प्राप्तिसम्भवम् ॥
नियतां तु फलप्राप्तिं यदा भावेन पश्यति ।
नियतां तां फलप्राप्तिं सगुणां परिचक्षते ॥
अभिप्रेतं समग्रं च प्रतिरूपं क्रियाफलम् ।
इतिवृत्ते भवेद्यस्मिन् फलयोगः प्रकीर्तितः ॥
सर्वस्यैव हि कार्यस्य प्रारब्धस्य फलार्थिभिः ।
एतास्त्वनुक्रमेणैव पञ्चावस्था भवन्ति हि ॥
आसां स्वभावभिन्नानां परस्परसमागमात् ।
विन्यास एकभावेन फलहेतुः प्रकीर्तितः ॥
इतिवृत्तं समाख्यातं प्रत्यगेवाधिकारिकम् ।
तदारम्भादि कर्तव्यं फलान्तं च यथा भवेत् ॥
पूर्णसन्धि च कर्तव्यं हीनसन्ध्यपि वा पुनः ।
नियमात् पूर्णसन्धि स्यादृधीनसन्ध्यथ कारणात् ॥

51 to 55

ईष्टस्यार्थस्य रचना वृत्तान्तस्यानुपक्षयः ।
रागप्राप्तिः प्रयोगस्य गुह्यानां चैव गूहनम् ॥
आश्चर्यवदभिख्यानं प्रकाश्यानां प्रकाशनम् ।
अङ्गानां षड्विधं ह्येतद् दृष्टं शास्त्रे प्रयोजनम् ॥
अङ्गहीनो नरो यद्वन्नवारम्भ क्षमो भवेत् ।
अङ्गहीनं तथा काव्यं न प्रयोगक्षमं भवेत् ॥
उदात्तमपि यत्काव्यं स्यादङ्गैः परिवर्जितम् ।
हीनत्वाद्धि प्रयोगस्य न सतां रञ्जयेन्मनः ॥
काव्यं यदपि हीनार्थं सम्यगङ्गैः समन्वितम् ।
दीप्तत्वात्तु प्रयोगस्य शोभामेति न संशयः ॥

144

(No. 120 in Ghosh)

योऽयं स्वभावो लोकस्य नानावस्थान्तरात्मकः ।
सोऽङ्गाद्यभिनयैर्युक्तो नाट्यमित्यभिधीयते ॥

द्वाविंशोऽध्यायः

99

(Book XXIVN, No.-98 in Ghosh)

भूयिष्ठमेव लोकोऽयं सुखमिच्छति सर्वदा ।
सुखस्य हि स्त्रियो मूलं नाना शीलाश्च ताः पुनः ॥

148

(146–147 in Ghosh)

धर्मार्थं हि तपश्चर्या सुखार्थं धर्म इष्यते ।
सुखस्य मूलं प्रमदास्तासु सम्भोग इष्यते ॥

पञ्चविंशोऽध्यायः

123

(XXVI–126 in Ghosh)

नानाशीलाः प्रकृतयः शीले नाट्यं प्रतिष्ठितम् ।
तस्माल्लोकप्रमाणं हि विज्ञेयं नाट्ययोक्तृभिः ॥

सप्तविंशोऽध्यायः

87 to 104

वारकालास्तु विज्ञेया नाट्यज्ञैर्विविधाश्रयाः ।
दिवसश्चैव रात्रिश्च तयोर्वारान् निबोधत ॥
[पूर्वाह्णस्त्वथ मध्याह्नस्त्वपराह्णस्तथैव च ।
दिवा समुत्था विज्ञेया नाट्यवारा प्रयोगतः ॥]
प्रादोषिकार्धरात्रिश्च तथा प्राभातिकोऽपरः ।
नाट्यवारा भवन्त्येते रात्रावित्यनुपूर्वशः ॥
एतेषां यत्र यद्योज्यं नाट्यकार्यं रसाश्रयम् ।
तदहं संप्रवक्ष्यामि वारकालसमाश्रयम् ॥
यच्छ्रोत्ररमणीयं स्याद्धर्मोत्थानकृतं च यत् ।
पूर्वाह्णे तत्प्रयोक्तव्यं शुद्धं वा विकृतं तथा ॥

सत्त्वोत्थानगुणैर्युक्तं वाद्यभूयिष्ठमेव च ।
पुष्कलं सत्त्वयुक्तं च अपराह्णे प्रयोजयेत् ॥
कैशिकीवृत्तिसंयुक्तं श्रृङ्गाररससंश्रयम् ।
नृत्तवादित्रगीताढ्यं प्रदोषे नाट्यमिष्यते ॥

यन्नर्महास्यबहुलं करुणप्रायमेव च ।
प्रभातकाले तत्कार्यं नाट्यं निद्राविनाशनम् ॥
अर्धरात्रे नियुञ्जीत समध्याह्ने तथैव च ।
सन्ध्याभोजनकाले च नाट्यं नैव प्रयोजयेत् ॥

एवं कालं च देशं समीक्ष्य च बलाबलम् ।
नित्यं नाट्यं प्रयुञ्जीत यथाभावं यथारसम् ॥
अथवा देशकालौ च न परीक्ष्यौ प्रयोक्तृभिः ।
यथैवाज्ञापयेद्भर्ता तदा योज्यमसंशयम् ॥

तथा समुदिताश्चैव विज्ञेया नाटकाश्रिताः ।
पात्रं प्रयोगमृद्धिश्च विज्ञेयास्तु त्रयो गुणाः ॥
बुद्धिमत्त्वं सुरूपत्वं लयतालज्ञता तथा ।
रसभावज्ञता चैव वयस्स्थत्वं कुतूहलम् ॥
ग्रहणं धारणं चैव गात्रावैकल्यमेव च ।
निजसाध्वसतोत्साह इति पात्रगतो विधिः ॥
सुवाद्यता सुगानत्वं सुपाठ्यत्वं तथैव च ।
शास्त्रकर्मसमायोगः प्रयोग इति संज्ञितः ॥
शुचिभूषणतायां तु माल्याभरणवाससाम् ।
विचित्ररचना चैव समृद्धिरिति संज्ञिता ॥
यदा समुदिताः सर्वे एकीभूता भवन्ति हि ।
अलङ्काराः सकुतपा मन्तव्यो नाटकाश्रयाः ॥
एतदुक्तं द्विजश्रेष्ठाः सिद्धीनां लक्षणं मया ।
अत ऊर्ध्वं प्रवक्ष्याम्यातोद्यानां च विकल्पनम् ॥

APPENDIX II

The Nāṭyaśāstra

The book numbers, the verse numbers and translations follow Manmohan Ghosh, *The Nāṭyaśāstra Ascribed to to Bharata Muni,* Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1957.

BOOK I

7–12 ;

"Get yourselves cleansed, be attentive and hear about the origin of the Nāṭyaveda devised by Brahman, O Brah-

mins, in the days of yore when the Golden Age (*Krtayuga*) passed with the reign of Svāyambhuva (Manu), and the Silver Age (*Tretāyuga*) commenced with the career of Vaivasvata Manu, and people became addicted to sensual pleasures, were under the sway of desire and greed, became infatuated with jealousy and anger and [thus] found their happiness mixed with sorrow, and Jambudvipa protected by the Lokapalas (guardians of the worlds) was full of gods, Dānavas, Gandharvas, Yaksa, Rāksasa, and great Uragas (Nāgas), the gods, with Indra (Mahendra) as their head, (approached) Brahman and spoke to him, 'We want an object of diversion, which must be audible as well as visible. As the Vedas are not to be listened to by those born as Sudras, be pleased to create another Veda which will belong to all the Colour–groups (*varṇa*)".

14–15 :

He then thought : "I shall make a fifth Veda on the Nātya with the Semi–historical Tales *(itihāsa)*, which will conduce to duty *(dharma)*, wealth *(artha)* as well as fame, will contain good counsel and collection [of other materials for human well–being], will give guidance to people of the future as well in all their actions, will be enriched by the teaching of all scriptures *(śāstra)* and will give a review of all arts and crafts *(śīlpa)*".

21–22 :

At these words of Brahman, Indra bowed to him with folded palms and said in reply, "O the best and holy one, gods are neither able to receive it and main-

tain it, nor are they fit to understand it and make use of it; they are unfit to do anything with the drama.

42–43 :

I [then went to Brahman and] after bowing, informed him [of my work]. Now Brahman (lit. the *guru* of gods) told me to include the Graceful *(kaiśikī)* Style also [in my performance], and he asked me to name materials conducive to its introduction.

43–45 :

Thus addressed by the master I replied, "Give me materials necessary for putting the Graceful *(kaiśikī)* Style into practice. At the time of Nilakantha's (Siva) dance I have seen his Graceful Style appropriate to the Erotic Sentiment, and this requires beautiful dresses and is endowed with gentle Angahāras and has Sentiments *(rasa)*, States *(bhava)* and action as its soul.

46–47 :

This Style cannot be practised properly by men except with the help of women." Then the powerful Lord (Brahman) created from his mind nymphs *(apsarās)* who were skillful in embellishing the drama, and gave them over to me [for helping me] in the performance.

106 :

In it (nāṭya) there is no exclusive representation of you [the Daityas] or of the gods : for the drama is a

representation of the state of the Three Worlds *(bhāvānu-kīrtana)*.

107 :

[In it] sometime there is [reference to] duty; sometimes to games, sometimes to money, sometimes to peace, and sometimes laughter is found in it, sometimes fight, sometimes love-making and sometimes killing [of people].

108–109 :

This teaches duty to those bent on doing their duty, love to those who are eager fɔr its fulfilment, and it chastises those who are ill-bread or unruly, promotes self-restraint in those who are disciplined, gives courage to cowards, energy to heroic persons, enlightens men of poor intellect and gives wisdom to the learned.

110 :

This gives diverson to kings, and firmness [of mind] to persons afflicted with sorrow, and [hints of acquiring] money to those who are earning it, and it brings composure to persons agitated in mind.

111–112 :

The drama as I have devised, is a mimicry of actions and conducts of people, which is rich in various emotions, and which depicts different situations. This will relate to actions of men good, bad and indifferent, and

will giee courage, amusement and happiness as counsel to them all.

BOOK II

7–8 ;

There are three types of playhouses devised by the wise Viśvakarman [the heavenly architect] in the treatise on his art (śāstra). They are oblong *(vikṛṣṭa)*, square *(caturasra)* and triangular *(tryasra)*.

18–19 :

No one should build a playhouse bigger than the above; for a play [produced] in it (i.e. a bigger house) will not be properly expressive. For anything recited or uttered in too big a playhouse will be losing euphony due to enunciated syllables being indistinct [to spectators not sitting sufficiently close to the stage].

80–82 :

The playhouse should be made like a mountain cavern and it should have two floors [on two different levels] and small windows; And it should be free from

wind and should have good acoustic quality. For [in such a playhouse] made free from the interference of wind, voice of actors and singers as well as the sound of musical instruments will be distinctly heard.

BOOK V

30–31 :

I shall now describe in detail the Āśrāvaṇā which is included in the Bahirgīta and shall speak of its origin as well as its justification.

31–32 :

Now when songs in seven forms and in Citra and Dakṣiṇa Mārgas together with the Upohana and the Nirgīta were started by musical experts like Nārada in praise of gods, all the gods and the Dānavas, in the assembly were made to hear the Nirgīta performed with proper tempo and time beat :

33–34 :

Now on hearing these happy songs praising the gods, the Daityas and the Rākṣasas were all provoked to jealousy.

34–36 :

Under these circumstances they pondered [over the matter] and said to one another : "We are glad to hear (lit. accept) this Nirgīta in accompaniment of the instrumental music, (and not the songs) in seven forms about the exploits of the gods, which they were pleased to hear; we shall hear the Nirgita only and shall always be pleased with it. Then these Daityas [and Rākṣasas] pleased with the Nirgīta urged for its repeated performance".

37–38 :

This enraged the gods who said to Nārada, "These Dānavas and Rākṣasas are pleased with the Nirgita only (and do not want anything else i.e. songs). Hence we wish this performance (of the Nirgīta) to come to an end. What do you think of this ?"

38–41 :

Hearing these words of the gods Nārada replied, "Let the Nirgīta dependent on the music of stringed instruments be not stopped, and this *(nirgīta)* combined with the Upohana and accompanied by the music of stringed instruments will have seven forms. Enraptured (lit. bound down) by this Nirgita the Daityas and the Rākṣasas will not be provoked and they will not create any obstruction [of the performance].

41–42 :

This is called Nirgīta to satisfy the vanity of the

Daityas while in honour of the gods it is called the Bahirgita.

42–44 :

This is to be played by experts on the Citraviṇa with metallic strings, and the performance should contain light and heavy syllables *(akṣara)* and have Varṇas and Alaṃkāras It is called the Nirgita because in it there is sung a combination of sounds carrying no sense, and to satisfy the jealousy of the gods it is called the Bahirgita".

BOOK VI

15 :

The eight Sentiments *(rasa)* recognised in drama are as follows : Erotic *(śṛṅgāra)*, Comic *(hāsya)*, Pathetic *(karuṇa)* Furious *(raudra)*, Heroic *(vīra)*, Terrible *(bhayānaka)* Odious *(bībhatsa)* and Marvellous *(abdhuta)*.

16 :

These eight are the Sentiments named by Brahman; I shall now speak of the Dominant, the Transitory and the Temperamental States.

17 :

The Dominant States *(sthāyibhāva)* are known to be the following : love, mirth, sorrow, anger, energy, terror, disgust and astonishment.

18–21 :

The thirtythree Transitory States *(vyabhicāribhāva)* are known to be the following : discouragement, weakness, apprehension, envy, intoxication, weariness, indolence, depression, anxiety, distraction, recollection, contentment, shame, inconstancy, joy, agitation, stupor, arrogance, despair, impatience, sleep, epilepsy, dreaming, awakening, indignation, dissimulation, cruelty, assurance, sickness, insanity, death, fright and deliberation. These are defined by their names.

22 :

Paralysis, Perspiration, Horripilation, Change of Voice, Trembling, Change of Colour, Weeping and Fainting are the eight Temperamental States.

23 :

The four kinds of Histronic Representation are Gestures *(āṅgika)*, Words *(vācika)*, Dresses and Make-up *(āhārya)* and the Representation of the Temperament *(sātvika)*.

24 :

The Practice of Representation *(dharmī)* in a drama-

tic performance is twofold : realistic (*lokadharmī*, lit. popular) and conventional (*nāṭyadharmī*. lit. theatrical).

32–33 :

Just as connoisseur of cooked food *(bhakta)* while eating food which has been prepared from various spices and other articles, taste it, so the learned people taste in their mind the Dominant States (such as love, sorrow etc.) when they are represented by an expression of the States with Gestures. Hence these Dominant States in a drama are called the Sentiments.

Now one enquires, "Do the States (*bhāva*) come out of the Sentiments (*rasa*) or the Sentiments come out of the States ?" On this point, some are of opinion that they arise from their mutual contact. But this is not so. Why ?

"It is apparent that the Sentiments arise from the States and not the States from the Sentiments. For [on this point] there are [traditional] couplets such as :

The States are so called by experts in drama, for they cause to originate (*bhāvayanti*) the Sentiments in connection with various modes of dramatic representation. Just as by many articles of various kinds auxiliary cooked food (*vyañjana*) is brought forth, so the States along with different kinds of Histrionic Representation will cause the Sentiments to originate.

BOOK VII

Bhāvas (States) explained

0-6 :

Now I shall speak of the *bhāvas* (States). An enquiry in this connexion is, "Why are the *bhāvas* (States) so called ? Is it because they *bhāvayanti* (pervade) and are hence called *bhāvas* (States) ?" It is said in reply that *bhāvas* (States) are so called because through Words, Gestures and the Representation of the Temperament, they *bhāvayanti* (infuse) the meaning of the play [into the spectators]. *Bhāva* is 'cause' or 'instrument', for words such as, *bhāvita*, *vāsita* and *kṛta* are synonymous. An expression like, 'O, all these things are *bhāvita* (pervaded) by one another's smell or moistened by one another's juice, is established even amongst the common people. Hence the root *bhāvaya* means 'to pervade'. On this point there are the following Ślokas :

1. When the meanings presented by Determinants and Consequents are made to pervade (*gamayte*) [the heart of the spectators] they are called *bhāvas* (States).

2. As in these the inner idea of the playwright (*kavi*) is made to pervade [the mind of the spectators] by means of Words, Gestures, colour of the face and the

Representation of the Temperam ent they are called bhāvas (States).

3. As they cause the Sentiments relating to various kinds of Histrionic Representation to parvade [the mind of the spectators], they are called bhāvas (States) by those who produce a drama.

Vibhāvas (Determinants) explained

"Now, why is the word *vibhāva* used ?" [Answer] : "The word *vibhāva* is used for the sake of clear knowledge. It is synonymous with *karaṇa*, *nimitta* and *hetu*. As Words, Gestures and the Representation of the Temperament are *vibāvyate* (determined) by this, it is called *vibhāva* (Determinant). *Vibhāvita* (also) means the same thing as *vijñāta* (clearly known).

On this point there is a Śloka :

4. As many things are *vibhāvyate* (determinded) by this through Words, Gestures and the Representation of the Temperament it is named *vibhāva* (Diterminant).

Anubhāvas (Consequents) explained

"Now, why is the word *anubhāva* used ?" (Answer) "Because the Histrionic Representation by means of Words, Gestures and the Temperament are *anubhāvyate* [made to be felt] by this, it is called *anubhāva* (Consequent).

On this point there is a Śloka :

5. As in it the spectators are *anubhāvyate* [made to feel] things by means of Words and Gestures it is called *anubhāva* and it relates to words as well as to [gestures and movements of] major and minor limbs.

Now we have explained that the States (*bhāva*) are related to Determinants (*vibhāva*) and Consequents (*anu-bhāva*). Thus are the States (*bhāva*) created. Hence we shall discuss the definitions and examples of the States together with their Determinants and Consequents. Of these, the Determinants and the Consequents are well–known among people. They being connected with the the human nature, their definitions are not discussed. This is for avoiding prolixity.

On this point there is the Śloka :

6. Determinants and Consequents are known by the wise to be things which are created by human nature and are in accordance with the ways of the world.

The three kinds of States : Dominant, Transitory and Temperamental.

Now the Dominant States (*sthāyi–bhāva*) are eight in number. The Transitory States (*vyabhicāriṇah*) are thirty-three and the Temperamental States are eight in number. These are the three varieties of the States. Hence we are to understand that there are fortynine States capable of drawing out the Sentiment from the play. The Sentiments arise from them when they are imbued with the quality of universality (*sāmānya*, lit. commonness).

Application of the States to the different Sentiments

107 :

These are the fortynine States (*bhāva*) of the three kinds mentioned by me. Now you ought to hear of the different Sentiments to which they are applicable.

108 :

All the (fortynine) States except indolence, cruelty and disgust are applicable to the Erotic Sentiment (lit. raise the Erotic Sentiment by their own name).

BOOK XIII

88-92 :

The Gait of a person riding a chariot should consist of simple (*cūrṇa*) steps. From the Samapāda Sthāna (posture) he is to make a mimicry of being carried in a chariot (lit. go the movement of a chariot), and with the one [hand he is to take up] the bow and with the other the pole [of the chariot]. And his charioteer is to remain busy with the whip and the reins, and the draught animals according to the class [of the vehicle] should be represented differently. And with quick and simple steps he is to enter the stage. The Gait of one in a celestial car (*vīmāna*) should be made like that of one riding a chariot. One who is about to mount [these vehicles] is to hold his body up and with opposite of this [motion] one is to make one's [descent from them].

1ʋ8 :

The Gait of a person riding a horse will consist of the Vaiśākha Sthāna and simple foot steps of the various kinds.

BOOK XX

I shall now describe the tenfold division of plays together with their names, functions and modes of production.

1–23 :

For their definition (*lakṣaṇa*) plays are known to be of ten kinds such as Nāṭaka, Prakarṇna, Aṅka (Utsṛṣti-kāṅka) Vyāyoga, Bhaṇa, Samavakara, Vīthi, Prahasana, Ḍima and Ihāmṛga I shall describe their chatacteristics in detail (lit. from thd beginning).

4 :

Styles (*vṛtti*) are known as the constituent elements of all dramatic works (lit. poems). Considering their production the ten kinds of play are considered to have proceeded from these.

5 :

Just as the Jātis and the Śrutis of notes constitute a scale (grāma), so varieties of Styles make up the dramatic composition (*kāvya–bandha*).

6 :

Just as the Ṣaḍja and the Madhyama scales include all the notes, so these two [kinds of] dramatic compositions (Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa) are made up of all the Styles.

The Nāṭaka and the Prakaraṇa are to be known as made up of all the Styles and they utilise all the different methods of constructions.

8–9 :

Plays of the Vithi, the Samavakāra, the Ihāmṛga, the Utsṛṣṭikāṅka (Aṅka), the Vyāyoga, the Bhāṇa, the Prahasana and the Ḍima classes should be made devoid of the Graceful Style. I shall hereafter describe the different methods of constructing plays.

10–11 :

[A play] which has for its subject–matter a well–known story, for its Hero a celebrated person of exalted nature (*udātta*) or which describes the character of a person descending from a royal seer, divine protection [for him], his many superhuman powers and exploits such as, success [in different undertakings] and amorous pastimes, and which has appropriate number of (lit. richly

furnished which) Acts (*aṅka*) and Introductory Scenes (*praveśaka*), is called a Nāṭaka.

46–47 :

At the conclusion of all the plays which contain various States and Sentiments, experts should always introduce the Marvellous Sentiment. Thus I have briefly but properly spoken about the characteristics of the Nāṭaka. I shall hereafter describe the Prakaraṇa by mentioning its characteristics.

BOOK XXI

The five Junctures of the Plot

1–17 :

1. The Plot (*itivṛtta*) has been called the body of the drama (lit. poem). It is known to be divided into five Junctures (*sandhi*).

The two kinds of Plot

2. The Plot is of two kinds : Principal (*ādhikārika*) and Subsidiary (*prāsaṅgika*).

Their definition

3. The [assemblage of] acts which are fabricated with a view to (lit, by reason of) the attainment of [some particular] result, is to be known as the Principal Plot. [Acts] other than these constitute the Subsidiary Plot.

4–5 :

The attainment of the result and its exaltation which the ingenuity of the playwright (lit. poet) plans by means of the associated characters (lit. Heroes) acting in a regular manner (lit. resorting to rules), constitute the Principal Plot on account of an attainment of the result. And any incident (lit. anything) mentioned for helping any other [incident] in it, is called the Subsidiary Plot.

The five stages of the Action

6. The exertion of the Hero (lit. one who strives) towards the result to be attained, is known to have five stages occurring in due order.

7. These five states of the Action are known to arise in the Nāṭaka and the Prakaraṇa. [Their] Fruition (*phala-yoga*) relates to duty (*dharma*), enjoyment of pleasure (*kāma*) and wealth (*artha*).

8. They are : Beginning (*prārambha*), Effort (*prayatna*), Possibility of Attainment (*prāpti-sambhava*), Certainty of Attainment (*niyata phala-prāpti*) and Attainment of the Result (*phala-prāpti*).

Beginning

9. That part of the play (lit. composition) which merely records eagerness about the final attainment of the result with reference to the Germ (*bīja*), is called the Beginning (*ārambha*).

Effort

10. [Hero's] striving towards an attainment of the Result when the same is not in view, and showing further eagerness [about it], is called the Efforts (*prayatna*).

Possibility of Attainment

11. When the attainment of the object is slightly suggested by an idea, it is to be known as the Possibility of Attainment (*prāpti-sambhava*).

Certainty of Attainment

12. When one visualises in idea a sure attainment of the result, it is called Certainty of Attainment (*niyata phala-prāpti*).

Attainment of the Result

13. When the intened result appears in full at the end of events [of a play] and corresponds to them, it is called Attainment of the Result (*phala-yoga*).

14. These are the five successive stages of every action begun by persons looking for results.

15. Putting together all these naturally different stages which come together [in a play] for the production of the result conduces towards the fruition.

Play to begin with the Principal Plot

16. The Principal Plot which has been described before should be taken up at the Beginning [of a play[for it is to attain fruition.

17. The Plot should either have all the Junctures (*sandhi)* or lack some of them. The [general] rule requires that all the Junctures should occur in it, but due to a]special] reason some of them me left out (lit. absent.)

The sixfold heeds of the Limbs of the Junctures

52–55 :

52–53. Exdressing the desired object, non–omission of any essential item in the Plot, accession to feeling in production, concealment of the object to be concealed, telling tales of surprise and disclosing thing to be disclosed are the sixfold nceds of the Limbs described in the *Śāstra*.

Uses of the Limbs of the Junctures

54. Just as a man without all his limbs is unablt fight a battle, so a play without the Limbs will be unfie for [successful] production.

55. A play (lit. a poem) though it may be poor as regards its theme (lit. meaning) will, when furnished with requisite Limbs, attain beauty because of the brilliance of its production.

120 :

And the human nature with its joys and sorrows

depicted through the means of representation such as Gestures, [Words, Costume and Temperament] is also called a drama (*nāṭya*).

BOOK XXIV

98 :

In this world people always desire happiness of which women are indeed the source. These women are of various nature.

146–147 :

Austerities are practised for the sake of virtue (*dharma*), and the [acquisition of] virtue is for the purpose of happiness. And happiness has its source in women the enjoyment of whose company is desired [by people in general].

BOOK XXVI

126 :

The people have different dispositions, and on their dispositions the drama rests. Hence playwrights and producers *(prayoktṛ)* should take the people as their authority [as regards the rules of the art].

BOOK XXVII

Suitable times for dramatic performance

88–105 :

88. Producers [of plays] should know the time (*kāla*) for a performance (*vāra*), which depends on various considerations to be [generally] day and night. Listen now when a performance may take place during these periods.

89. The performance in the evening, the midnight and the dawn belongs to the night.

90. The performance in the forenoon and the afternoon belongs to the day.

Time of performance according the subject and the Sentiment

91. I shall now speak how these times are suited to [different] Sentimants after mentioning the time (*kāla*) to which a performance belongs.

92. [The performance] which is pleasant to the ear and is based on a tale of virtue (*dharma*), whether it is pure (*Suddha*) or mixed (*vikṛta*), should be held in the forenoon.

93. That which is rich in instrumental music, includes the story of strength and energy, and carries [a chance of] abundant success should be performed in the afternoon.

94. That which relates to the Graceful Style, the Erotic Sentiment and is full of vocal and instrumental music should be performed in the evening.

95. The drama which relates to the magnanimity [of the Hero], and contains mostly the Pathetic Sentiment should be performed in the morning and it will scare away sleep.

96. The drama should not be performed in the midnight or at noon or at the time of the Sandhyā prayer or of taking meals.

97. Thus after looking into the time, place and the basis (plot) of a play one should bring about its pro-

duction according to the States and the Sentiments it contains.

Emerfiency performances are independent of time

98. But when the patron (lit. master) orders, the time and place are not to be taken into consideration and the performance should be held without any hesitation.

99. Proper Co-ordination (lit. co-ordinated production) Brilliance [of Pageant] (*samṛddhi*), and actors capable of [good] production are the three [points of] merits [in a performance].

Qualities of an actor

100–101 :

Intelligence, strength, physical beauty, knowledge of Time (*tāla*) and tempo (*laya*), appreciation of the States and the Sentiments, [proper] age, curiosity, acquisition [of knowledge and arts], [their] retention, vocal music, dances, suppression of stage-fright, and enthusiasm will be the requisties of an actor ((*pātra*).

An ideal performance

102. That which includes good instrumental music, good songs, good recitatives as well as Co-ordination of all acts prescribed by the Śāstra, is called an [ideal] production.

Brilliance of Pageant

103. Use of proper ornaments, good garlands, clothes and proper painting or the Make-up [for the characters] gives rise to Brilliance of Pageant (*samṛddhi*).

The best performance

104. According to the producers of plays the best (lit. the ornament) [of the performance] occurs when all these factors combine.

105. Thus I have spoken to you properly of the characteristics of the Success. Now I shall speak to you about the different branches of music (*ātodya*, lit. instrumental music).

APPENDIX III

अत्रेति—नाट्यवेदे । न देवासुराणामेकान्तेनानुभावनम् । नैव तेऽनुभाव्यन्ते केनचित्प्रकारेण । तथाहि–तेषु न तत्त्वेन धीः । न सादृश्येन यमलकवत् । न भ्रान्तत्वेन रूप्यस्मृतिपूर्वकशुक्तिरूप्यवत् । नारोपेण सम्यग्ज्ञानबाधानन्तरमिथ्याज्ञानरूपेण मुखं चन्द्र इतिवत् । न तदध्यवसायेन गौर्वाहीकवत् । नोत्प्रेक्ष्यमाणत्वेन चन्द्रमुखवत् । न तत्प्रतिकृतित्वेन चित्रपुस्तवत् । न तदनुकारेण गुरुशिष्यव्याख्याहेवाकवत् । न तात्कालिकनिर्माणेनेन्द्रजालवत् । न युक्तिविरचिततदाभासतया हस्तलाववादिमायावत् । सर्वेष्वेतेषु पक्षेष्वसाधारणतया द्रष्टुरौदासीन्ये रसास्वादायोगात् । कवेश्च नियतवर्णनीयनिश्चितत्वे काव्यस्यैवासम्पत्तेरनौचित्यावर्जनयोगात् । लौकिकमिथुनदर्शीव सांसारिकहर्षक्रोधान्वयितापत्तेरुभयदर्शनाकुलतया मुख्यदृष्टौ प्रयोक्तृदृष्टौ तद्धि सम्पत्त्य-(द्धिसंवित्त्य) भावात ॥

प्रथमोऽध्यायः, (श्लो. 107),

अभिनवभारती—पृ. 34.

विघ्नाश्चास्यां प्रतिपत्तावयोग्यता संभावनाविरहो नाम स्वगतत्वनियमेन देशकालविशेषावेशो निजसुखादि-विवशीभावः प्रतीत्युपायवैकल्यं स्फुटत्वाभावो अप्रधानता संशययोगश्च ॥

षष्ठोऽध्यायः, अभिनवभारती on
रससूत्रम्, पृ. 279.

षष्ठोऽध्यायः

after 82 .

अथ शान्तो नाम शमस्थायिभावात्मको मोक्षप्रवर्तकः । स तु तत्त्वज्ञानवैराग्याशयशुद्ध्यादिभिर्विभावैः समुत्पद्यते । तस्य यमनियमाध्यात्मध्यानधारणोपासनसर्वभूतदयालिङ्गग्र-हणादिभिरनुभावैरभिनयः प्रयोक्तव्यः । व्यभिचारिणश्चास्य निर्वेदस्मृतिधृतिसर्वाश्रमशौचस्तम्भरोमाञ्चादयः । अत्रार्याः श्लोकाश्च भवन्ति—

मोक्षाध्यात्मसमुत्थस्तत्त्वज्ञानार्थहेतुसंयुक्तः ।
नैःश्रेयसोपदिष्टः शान्तरसो नाम सम्भवति ॥

बुद्धीन्द्रियकर्मेन्द्रियसंरोधाध्यात्मसंस्थितोपेतः ।
सर्वप्राणिसुखहितः शान्तरसो नाम विज्ञेयः ॥

न यत्र दुःखं न सुखं न द्वेषो नापि मत्सरः ।
समः सर्वेषु भूतेषु स शान्तः प्रथितो रसः ॥

भावाः विकारा रत्याद्याः शान्तस्तु प्रकृतिर्मतः ।
विकारः प्रकृतेर्जातः पुनस्तत्रैव लीयते ॥

स्वं स्वं निमित्तमासाद्य शान्ताद्भावः प्रवर्तते ।
पुनर्निमित्तापाये च शान्त एवोपलीयते ॥
एवं नवरसा दृष्टा नाट्यज्ञैर्लक्षणान्विताः ।
एवमेते रसा ज्ञेयास्त्वष्टौ लक्षणलक्षिताः ।
अत ऊर्ध्वं प्रवक्ष्यामि भावानामपि लक्षणम् ॥

॥इति षष्ठोऽध्यायः ॥

APPENDIX IV

Shakespeare :

A Midsummer Night's Dream

From Act I Scene 2 :

Enter Quince, *the Carpenter*; and Snug, *the Joiner*; Bottom, *the Weaver*; and Flute, *the Bellows–mender* and Snout, the *the Tinker*; and Starveling, *the Tailor*.

Quin. Is all our company here ?

Bot. You were best to call them generally, man by man, according to the scrip.

Quin. Here is the scroll of every man's name which is thought fit through all Athens to play in our interlude before the Duke and the Duchess on his wedding-day and night.

Bot. First, good Peter Quince, say what the play treats on; then read the names of the actors; and so grow to a point.

Quin. Marry, our play is 'The most lamentable comedy, and most cruel death of Pyramus and Thisbe'.

o o o

From Act III Scene I

Quince, Bottom, Śnug, Flute,

Bot. Are we all met ?

Quin. Pat, pat; and here's a marvellous convenient place for our rehearsal. This green plot shall be our stage, this hawthon–brake our tiring house; and we will do it in action, as we will do it before the Duke.

Bot. Peter Quince !

Quin. What sayest thou, bully Bottom ?

Bot. There are things in this comedy of Pyramus and Thisbe that will never please. First, Pyramus must draw a sword to kill himself; which the ladies cannot abide. How answer you that ?

Snot. Byrlakin, a parlous fear.

Star. I believe we must leave the killing out, when all is done.

Bot. Not a whit; I have a device to make all well. Write me a prologue, and let the prologue seem to say we will do no harm with our swords, and that Pyramus is not killed indeed; and for the more better assurance, tell them that I, Pyramus, am not Pyramus, but Bottom the weaver. This will put them out of fear.

Qnin. Well, we have such a prologue; and it shall be written in eight and six.

Bot. No, make it two more; let it be written in eight and eight.

Snout. Will not the ladies be afeard of the lion ?

Star. I fear it, I promise you.

Bot. Masters, you ought to consider with yourself; to bring in (God shield us !) a lion among ladies is a most dreadful thing; for there is not a more fearful wild-fowl than your lion living; and we ought to look to't.

Snout. Therefore another prologue must tell he is not a lion.

Bot. Nay, you must name his name, and half his face must be seen through the lion's neck; and he

himself must speak through, saying thus, or to the same defect : 'Ladies', or 'Fair ladies, I would wish you', or 'I would request you', or 'I would entreat you, not to tremble : my life for yours ! If you think I come hither as a lion, it were pity of my life. No, I am no such thing; I am a man, as other men are' : and there, indeed, let him name his name, and tell them plainly he is Snug the joiner.

Quin. Well, it shall be so. But there is two hard things : that is, to bring the moonlight into a chamber; for you know, Pyramus and Thisbe meet by moonlight.

Snout. Doth the moon shine that night we play our play ?

Bot. A calendar, a calendar ! Look in the almanac; find out moonshine, find out moonshine !

Quin. Yes, it doth shine that night.

Bot. Why, then may you leave a casement of the great chamber window, where we play, open; and the moon may shine in at the casement.

Quin. Ay; or else one must come in with a bush of thorns and a lantern, and say he comes to disfigure or to present the person of Moonshine. Then there is another thing : we must have a wall in the great chamber; for Pyramus and Thisbe, says the story, did talk through the chink of a wall.

Snout. You can never bring in a wall. What say you, Bottom ?

Bot. Some man or other must present Wall; and let him have some plaster, or some roughcast abous him to signify Wall; and let nim hold his fingert thus, and through that cranny shall Pyramus and Thisbe whisper.

Quin. If that may be, then all is well. . . .